

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -- beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

73-30,247

ARRINGTON, Theodore Self, 1945-
BELIEF SYSTEMS IN POLITICAL PARTY STRATARCHIES.

The University of Arizona, Ph.D., 1973
Political Science, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company , Ann Arbor, Michigan

© COPYRIGHTED

BY

THEODORE SELF ARRINGTON

1973

BELIEF SYSTEMS IN POLITICAL PARTY STRATARCHIES

by

Theodore Self Arrington

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 3

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my
direction by Theodore Self Arrington
entitled BELIEF SYSTEMS IN POLITICAL PARTY STRATARCHIES

be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement of the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

James W. Clacke 6-25-73
Dissertation Director Date

After inspection of the final copy of the dissertation, the
following members of the Final Examination Committee concur in
its approval and recommend its acceptance:*

<u>Henry C. Kerahi</u>	<u>6-25-73</u>
<u>James B. Hogan</u>	<u>6/25/73</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____

*This approval and acceptance is contingent on the candidate's
adequate performance and defense of this dissertation at the
final oral examination. The inclusion of this sheet bound into
the library copy of the dissertation is evidence of satisfactory
performance at the final examination.

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: Theodore S. Frington

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are two groups of people without whom this dissertation could never have been written. The first of these is the political gladiators of Tucson, Arizona. Without the patience, understanding, and good will of the eighty activists who consented to be interviewed, the project would have been impossible.

The second group is my colleagues who gave me encouragement, advice, and well warranted criticism. Drs. James W. Clarke, James Hogan, and Henry Kenski fulfilled their roles as mentors with great skill. Ms. Tanya Connors instructed me in the use of the NEWCRS program which generated the statistics used throughout the study.

And, of course, I must acknowledge the moral support given to me by my loving wife, Pat.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	ix
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Framework for Analysis: The Belief System	2
The Literature	4
The Source of Ideology	4
Partisanship	6
Issue Consciousness	8
Ideology and Stratarchies	10
Psychological Traits	13
Party Expectations	15
Psychological Traits, Party Expectations, and Stratarchies	16
The Variables	17
Ideology	17
Dogmatism	21
Machiavellianism	22
Party Expectations	24
Party Experience	25
Socioeconomic Status	30
The Sample	30
Statistical Methods	35
Research Questions	37
2. IDEOLOGY AND PARTY EXPERIENCE	39
Party Experience Variables	39
Measuring Ideology	44
Issue Consciousness	44
Partisanship	46
Party Experience and Issue Consciousness	49
Party Experience and Partisanship	52
Summary	54
3. PARTY EXPECTATIONS AND PARTY EXPERIENCE	55
Measuring Professionalism	55
Party Expectations and Ideology	58

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
Desire for Programmatic Parties and Party Experience . . .	58
Willingness to Compromise to Win and Party Experience . . .	61
Desire for Intraparty Democracy and Party Experience . . .	64
Summary	68
4. MACHIAVELLIANISM, DOGMATISM, AND PARTY EXPERIENCE	69
Measuring Machiavellianism and Dogmatism	69
Machiavellianism	69
Dogmatism	70
Machiavellianism, Dogmatism, and Other Belief System Variables	71
Machiavellianism and Party Experience	71
Dogmatism and Party Experience	74
Summary	77
5. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND PARTY EXPERIENCE	78
Demographic Profile of the Sample	78
Socioeconomic Status and Belief System Variables	81
Socioeconomic Status and Party Experience	81
Ethno/Race and Party Experience	86
Summary	89
6. CONCLUSION	90
Groups of Like Minded People	91
The Interrelationships of the Belief System Variables	93
Party Experience and Ideology	94
Issue Consciousness	94
Partisanship	96
Party Experience and Party Expectations	98
Desire for Programmatic Parties	99
Willingness to Compromise to Win	99
Desire for Intraparty Democracy	100
Machiavellianism	101
Dogmatism	102
Socioeconomic Status	104
SES and the Belief System	104
SES and Party Experience	105
Further Research	105
Practical Politics	106
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	110
APPENDIX B: COMPLETE LISTING OF ALL RESPONSES TO THE FOUR OPEN-ENDED IDEOLOGY QUESTIONS	126
REFERENCES	138

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1.1 Guide to Position of Variables in Questionnaire	19
1.2 The Size of the Samples	32
2.1 Relationship of Position in the Stratarchy to Some Other Party Experience Variables	41
2.2 Rank Ordering of the Issue Areas Mentioned in Response to the Four Ideology Questions	45
2.3 Partisan Issues Derived from the Responses to the Four Ideology Questions	47
2.4 Gamma Relationships Between Issue Consciousness and Party Experience Controlling for Selected Variables	50
2.5 Gamma Relationships Between Partisanship and Party Experience Controlling for Selected Variables	53
3.1 Gamma Relationships Between Party Expectation and Ideology Variables	59
3.2 Gamma Relationships Between Desire for Programmatic Parties and Party Experience Controlling for Selected Variables	60
3.3 Gamma Relationships Between Willingness to Compromise to Win and Party Experience Controlling for Selected Variables	62
3.4 Gamma Relationships Between Desire for Intraparty Democracy and Party Experience Controlling for Selected Variables	65
4.1 Gamma Relationships of Machiavellianism and Dogmatism to Party Expectation and Ideological Variables	72
4.2 Gamma Relationships Between Machiavellianism and Party Experience Controlling for Selected Variables	73
4.3 Gamma Relationships Between Dogmatism and Party Experience Controlling for Selected Variables	75

LIST OF TABLES --Continued

Table		Page
5.1	Demographic Profile of the Sample	79
5.2	Gamma Relationships Among Socioeconomic Variables	80
5.3	Gamma Relationships of Socioeconomic Variables, Party Expectation Variables, Dogmatism, and Machiavellianism . .	82
5.4	Gamma Relationships Between Party Experience and Socio- economic Variables	84
5.5	Gamma Relationships Between Ethno/Race and Party Experience Variables Controlling for Selected Variables .	87
6.1	Summary of Meaningful Gamma Relationships Between Belief System Variables and Party Experience Variables . .	95

ABSTRACT

In the study of party elites, attention has recently been focused on psychological traits and ideology. However, there is no large body of research which is directed to the questions:

1. Are there differences between the attitudes and ideology of individuals who occupy the various strata of major American political parties?

2. If there are such differences, what factors are associated with them?

These questions are examined by a survey research study of political activists in Tucson, Arizona, using largely open-ended questions. The sample is drawn in such a way as to include individuals with varying amounts and kinds of party experiences from three distinct strata of the political parties: Candidates, executive committeemen, and political novices.

The answer to the first question is a qualified "no." Political activists largely share attitudes and beliefs with others in their own party. They mostly agree that the parties should be more programmatic and democratic, and one should not compromise on issues to win elections. Almost all the respondents had low scores on scales of "machivellianism" and "dogmatism." The adherents of each party share an "ideology" or a set of ideas about what government should and should not do. This wide sharing of belief systems indicates that there is a

"pool" of individuals with certain characteristics (beliefs, attitudes, social and educational background) from which the party recruits individuals for the different strata of the party organization. Party socialization is minimal.

There are minor differences between activists on most of the belief system variables, and wide differences between the respondents on "issue consciousness" or the ability to articulate issues and government policy. These variables are not highly interrelated. Ideology, attitudes toward the proper role of parties, and personality traits such as dogmatism and machiavellianism are separate distinct elements of belief.

Issue consciousness is strongly related to ambition. Those who wish to attain public office are more articulate than those who are satisfied with party office. The more issue conscious activists are also less loyal to their party. Partisanship is related to self described role. Those who claim an ideological or altruistic reason for political involvement are more partisan than those who claim personal motivation. The more partisan party workers are more loyal to the party.

Attitudes toward the proper role of the party are too complex to be described by a single variable such as "professionalism." Desire for programmatic parties appears to be related to the intensity of participation in politics. Those who work the most for the party are the least concerned with greater policy orientation. Activists who have been involved with the party for a long period of time and have deep familial roots in the party are more likely to be willing to compromise to win elections. The newcomer is less flexible. Those who are willing to

compromise are also less loyal to the party. Various measures of satisfaction with political activity are associated with desire for intra-party democracy. Activists who are discontented seem to feel that increased democracy in party councils would be a desirable goal.

No party experience variables were meaningfully related to machiavellianism. Democratic novices are slightly more dogmatic than Republicans, and those who gave altruistic reasons or ideological motivations for political activity are more dogmatic than those who are personally motivated.

Activists who have high socioeconomic status are more likely to attain high position in either party than are the less favored activists. Women, Mexican-Americans, and blacks work harder for the party, but do not attain important positions as often as do Anglo males.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the study of political elites, and party elites in particular, attention has recently been focused on psychological traits and ideology. Almost all of this research has been directed to delineating the differences between elite groups, such as party workers, and the mass of citizens. There is no large body of research which is directed to the questions:

1. Are there differences between the attitudes and ideology of individuals who occupy the various strata of major American political parties?
2. If there are such differences, what factors are associated with them?

This dissertation examines the first question using a survey research study of the political party elites of Tucson, Arizona. The study also clarifies some aspects of the second question and points the way for future research.

The idea of dividing political parties into strata is an old one. Even the normative research on parties involves analysis of its segments. Theorists usually assert that one of these parts ought to be dominant in policy making functions (e.g., Duverger 1954). Yet it is not clear that there are systematic differences between party strata,

nor is it clear what causes any differences that may exist. In the absence of information about ideological and psychological differences, debates about which segments are or ought to be dominant are essentially sterile.

Framework for Analysis: The Belief System

The ideological and psychological variables used in this dissertation are conceived as being parts of the "belief systems" of party activists. The concept "belief system" has recently been developed by social scientists to help the conceptualization of some rather unruly notions such as personality and ideology.

Philip Converse has done the most to delineate clearly the meaning of "belief system," and his works on the subject are a critical methodological turning point for political science. He defines "belief system" as: "a configuration of ideas and attitudes in which the elements are bound together by some form of constraint or functional interdependence" (1964, p. 207). Notice that this is "a" configuration not "the" configuration. The researcher selects certain attitudes for study and relates them using his own criteria.

Possible objects of attitudes are infinite, and a person can be seen as a vibrant bundle of attitudes [a typical social-psychological model] without any assurance that his attitudes extend to more than a very tiny subset of such objects. Phenomenological differences in information and attention almost ensure the contrary; it may well be difficult to find objects in most domains which will not be matters of non-attitudes for many members of the test population (Converse 1970, p. 177).

In asking about a political belief system, one is only interested in some of the attitudes of respondents; and most respondents will lack attitudes about some aspects of politics.

The various individual ideas and attitudes are referred to by Converse as "idea-elements." These can cover a wide "range" of objects or referents, or a narrow range depending on the parameters placed on the belief system by the researcher and the limits of the respondent's own cognitive system. Some idea-elements are "central" which means that other idea-elements depend on them in some functional manner. A change in a central idea-element would bring about change in some less central or "peripheral" elements, but a change in peripheral elements would not necessarily affect those that are more central.

The most important concept that Converse has delineated is that of "constraint." He defines constraint as "the success we would have in predicting, given initial knowledge that an individual holds a specified attitude, that he holds certain further ideas and attitudes" (1964, p. 207). In an individual's belief system how strongly is one attitude related to other attitudes? This is "constraint." The reason why idea-elements are related in the belief system is referred to as the "source of constraint."

Converse has found three sources of constraint (1964, pp. 209-211). The first of these is logic. It is fairly obvious that if idea-elements are logically related then the individual has some guide as to which idea-elements go together. The second source of constraint is "psychological," which is when two or more idea-elements are logically related to a more central notion. The last source of constraint is "social." By this Converse means that "its roots are in the configuration of interests and information that characterize particular niches

in the social structure" (1964, p. 211). Idea-elements may go together because certain groups socialize their members to believe them, or recruit only people who hold the ideas.

The Literature

There are only three published works which examine the variation in ideology or psychology between the different strata of political parties. These are Eldersveld (1964), Valen and Katz (1964), and Costantini (1963). This dissertation goes beyond their work and utilizes a different methodology derived from Converse's work on belief systems. The rest of the literature does not differentiate between the various segments of parties, although an unsupported hypothesis about such distinctions does occasionally appear elsewhere.

The Source of Ideology

The term "ideology" has many different meanings as Minar (1961) has effectively shown. Scholars have insisted on trying to find the "real meaning" of "ideology" as if some universal significance existed separate from usage. For those with a more practical mind it should be sufficient to note that different writers use the term to mean different things at different times and places. In this study, "ideology" is a set of beliefs about what government should and should not do that is held in common by the members of a group or public. This usage is more or less similar to that of most modern American social scientists. For example, Dolbeare and Dolbeare (1971, p. 14), Barnes (1966; 1968, p. 114), Sorauf (1968, pp. 381-2), Rokeach (1968, pp. 123-4), and McDonald (1963, p. 8) all define the term similarly. For those who

dissent from this usage, it is common to argue that to be "ideology" a set of beliefs must have special coherence, logical interrelationships, or be uncommonly broad in scope. I do not choose to use the term in that way. As used here, "ideology" is synonymous with "political belief system."

Much of the confusion in the use of the term "ideology" has been the result of efforts to find logical or psychological sources for constraint within political belief systems in the Western World. Those who fail to find such sources of constraint often conclude that "ideology has ended" (Bell 1960). Yet use of the term persists. A conclusion more in keeping with such usage would be that political belief systems in the Western World (particularly the United States) have social sources of constraint. Converse (1964) argues persuasively that social constraint is virtually the only kind that has any importance in American politics. Those who have attempted to find logical or psychological sources of constraint in political belief systems in America and Britain have been frustrated (Brittan 1968; Lipset and Raab 1970, chapter 1; Kessel 1972, p. 463; Lowi 1969, pp. 58-60; Eldersveld 1964, p. 194; Cantril and Free 1967; and Converse 1964, p. 223).

Groups in society are the source of constraint. They have interests, configurations of sub-group participants, and unique histories that give the group a set of idea-elements for the belief system of its members. These idea-elements may not be logically or psychologically connected, and they may even contradict each other. They are transferred to the members of the group through the processes of recruitment and socialization.

Most of the literature on American political belief systems would seem to indicate that political party affiliation is the major source of constraint. This would seem to be the conclusion of Campbell et al. (1963, pp. 124-144), and the reason for their emphasis on party identification. Others have emphasized that the party has the most impact on the belief systems of party activists:

. . . in the case of party leaders the political party appears to function as a reference group that exerts an important independent influence on their belief systems. In this situation, we may surmise that the influence the party has in determining the beliefs of its most active members would contrast sharply with its influence on the average citizen for whom party affiliation is a casual (albeit important) attachment that becomes salient only periodically . . . unresolved questions involve the extent to which ideological commitments precede the entry of party leaders into politics and whether and how party activity itself provides positive or negative inducements that influence the belief systems of these leaders (Soule and Clarke 1971, pp. 89 and 90).

The same line of thought can be found in the writings of Jacob (1962, p. 708), James (1969, p. 166), Eldersveld (1964, p. 218), McClosky, Hoffman, and O'Hara (1960, p. 407), Sorauf (1964, p. 96; 1963, p. 151), Scoble (1967, p. 42), McDonald (1963, chapter III), and Hennessy (1970, pp. 472-3). Moreover, this conclusion is consistent with all the basic insights of the social psychological literature which suggests the impact of groups on individuals' thought processes (Greenstein 1969, pp. 52-4).

Partisanship

At one time, American political parties were thought to be alike in their ideological beliefs. Lord Bryce, in a comment on American party politics, described the Republicans and the Democrats as being

like two bottles with different labels, but both bottles empty (Riker 1962, p. 97). Before 1960 most political scientists would have agreed with Bryce. Those who used a a priori reasoning about political parties, such as Anthony Downs (1957), found ample reason for parties beclouding issues and trying to be all things to all men. Similarly, the empirical studies of party activists done before 1960 seemed to show little difference between the parties on questions of governmental policy (Gosnell 1937 and Forthall 1946).

In 1960, McClosky et al. published an article which contradicted this traditional wisdom. They admit that there are pressures in American society which tend to force the two parties into similar policy positions. Among these are a homogeneous political culture and the fact that both parties must compete for the same votes. But they contend that there are contrary influences which counteract these forces and make the two parties distinct.

We believe that the homogenizing tendencies referred to are strongly offset by contrary influences, and that voters are preponderantly led to support the party whose opinions they share. We further thought that the competition for office, though giving rise to similarities between the parties, also impels them to diverge from each other in order to sharpen their respective appeals. For this and other reasons, we expected to find that the leaders of the two parties, instead of ignoring differences alleged to exist within the electorate, would differ on issues more sharply than their followers would (p. 407).

To back up this new idea, McClosky et al. had an impressive set of data on the policy positions of a sample of the American public and delegates to the Democratic and Republican national conventions in 1956.

The publication of the McClosky et al. "leaders and followers" article introduced a flood of new research, all of which seemed to

reinforce their basic conclusions. The McClosky notion has been applied to a wide variety of geographic areas and different segments of the parties. It has always been confirmed in each published source. The major published examinations of the McClosky et al. thesis are: Marvick and Nixon (1961); Hirschfield, Swanson, and Blank (1962); Sorauf (1963); Flinn and Wirt (1965); Ippolito (1969b); Flinn (1964); Agger, Goldrich, and Swanson (1964); Eldersveld (1964); Mayhew (1966); Scoble (1967); Lowi (1967); Pierce (1970); Nexon (1971); Soule and Clarke (1971).

The sharp about-face taken in the literature around 1960 has caused some confusion among students of political parties in the United States. Were Bryce and all other political analysts in the first half of this century so completely wrong about party belief systems? Or have the parties themselves changed? Elsewhere it is argued that the parties have become ideological entities since the Great Depression and the New Deal coalition of Franklin D. Roosevelt (Arrington, 1969). More recent research has indicated that the voters have responded to this ideological clarity within the parties by becoming increasingly policy conscious (Pomper 1971, 1972; Boyd 1972; Brody and Page 1972; and Kessel 1972). In any case, the ideological nature of present day American political parties has been clearly demonstrated.

Issue Consciousness

Philip Converse (1964, 1970) has shown that political activists know more about public policies, possess a stronger issue orientation, and are more concerned about politics than are non-activists. This idea is distinct from the McClosky thesis which says that party activists

will be more likely to possess partisan belief systems. The two hypotheses are not contradictory. Both issue consciousness and partisanship can be seen to be related to the individual's association with political parties. Converse argues that differences in issue consciousness were not revealed by research which used closed-ended and Likert summated scale type questions to measure ideology. He has found that most respondents guessed at the answers to questions about which they had no opinions. Converse calls these responses "non-attitudes." Party activists have many more idea-elements in their political belief systems and are not as prone to non-attitudes.

Lacking such cues, group or belief system constraints the citizen innocent of "ideology" is likely to make rather capricious constructions, since the issue is probably one that he has never thought about before and will never think about again except when being interviewed (Converse 1964, p. 241).

In recent years Hennessy (1970, p. 461), Milbrath (1968, p. 30), Kessel (1972, p. 465), and McClosky (1964, pp. 373-4) have supported his research, while two published works contradict the Converse non-attitudes thesis. Brown (1970) did an abbreviated research project using students and their close friends to test Converse's notion. The careless way he handled the subject brings his research into question. Luttbeg (1968, p. 401) has done a careful and thoughtful study which seems to show that political leaders have just as many non-attitudes as followers. He utilized local issues exclusively, and failed to divide his leaders into partisan groups. This makes it difficult to evaluate his work. In any case, these are the only pieces of contradictory evidence in a whole sea of supportive research.

Ideology and Stratarchies

The available evidence on ideological differences within party groups is diverse. Converse (1964, pp. 228-231) argues that those who spend more time and attention on party activity and politics are more likely to be issue conscious and partisan. He is supported in this by Marvick and Nixon (1961, pp. 210-14), Valen and Katz (1964, p. 263), Eldersveld (1964, chapter 8), and Harned (1961). Costantini (1963) notes that his "top leaders" are more "moderate" than his "middle level leaders," and Soule and Clarke (1971, pp. 86-7) indicate that newcomers to politics are more "ideological" than oldtimers.

There is evidence that candidates for public office are more "moderate" than those in the party organization, even though candidates are more involved in party activity as both Joyner (1971, p. 94) and Barber (1965, p. 221) note. Candidacy is usually considered a "quantum jump" from the party organization because it requires that an individual reorient his entire life style, while participation in the party organization requires only minimal changes. Epstein (1967, pp. 103-17) notes that in studies of American and British parties, office holders were found to be more "moderate." He indicates that the office holder is motivated to participate by the desire to gain and hold office, while the organization derives nothing from office holding (in this post-patronage world) and therefore must depend on ideological satisfactions for participation. Sorauf (1964, p. 70) endorses Epstein's position completely. Elsewhere Sorauf (1963, p. 89) notes that constituency influences also play a role in making office holders more moderate. The candidate must face an electorate that is only partly made up of

partisans. This position is one that V. O. Key mentioned many years ago (1958, p. 241). While Luttbeg (1965, pp. 163-4) and Kingdon (1966, pp. 126-7) downgrade the effects of constituency pressures, it is still true that there is some reason to suspect greater "moderation" among office holders as compared to other strata of the party.

It may appear that leaders could be both more "partisan" and more "moderate." An examination of the methodology utilized in these studies shows that this is impossible. As operationalized in most studies "moderation" is synonymous with "non-partisanship." The distinction between these ideas may seem obvious, yet it has never been clearly made. Researchers who utilize Likert type questions and summated scales to measure ideology often confuse party cohesion (a measure of agreement within a group) with moderation on issues. Most of these authors who speak in terms of "moderation" have made this mistake. It can most clearly be seen in a recent work by David Nexon (1971). (See the response to his article by Arrington 1972.) This problem arises because of the procedures used to score ideology. If one has a group called "the totalitarians" which contains both Nazis and Communists, one might find their aggregate opinion on certain issues to be "moderate," that is "in the middle." Yet to term the group "moderate" would be something less than accurate. It is also possible to confuse moderation with a lack of constraint, and extremeness with high constraint. This mistake is made when the scores of an individual on various issues are aggregated to form a single score for that individual. A person who believed in socialism (a "left wing" idea), but was against equal rights for

blacks (a "right wing" idea) might end up with a "moderate" score on a left-right summated scale. Here too the conclusion of moderation is fallacious.

Other kinds of behavior have also been related to ideology by those doing research on party activists. For example, Eldersveld (1964, pp. 212-4) found some interesting, but complex, patterns of relationship between the partisanship of an activist's parents and his own ideological inclinations. Other researchers have looked into the subject of the motivation for involvement in politics. This work indicates that at least twenty-five percent of partisans get involved for ideological reasons. The rest are there for personal, social, professional, or no good reason at all (Arrington 1969; Kingdon 1966, pp. 54-60; Ippolito 1969a, p. 808; Ippolito and Bowman 1969, p. 574; McClosky 1964, pp. 375-6; Sorauf 1964, pp. 82-6 and 1963, p. 99; Valen and Katz 1964, pp. 289-290; and Lane 1959, p. 114). Only one published source has related motivation to ideology (Eldersveld 1964, pp. 212-4) and he found no relationship.

Eldersveld (1964, pp. 202-5) and Soule and Clarke (1971, p. 85) both related competition for office to ideology and found that competition sharpens ideological differences between the parties, and ideological similarity within them. However, Sorauf (1963, pp. 140-3) notes just the opposite with regard to legislators. Sorauf (1963, pp. 63-5) and Eldersveld (1964, pp. 214-5) both indicate that individuals with more ambition to attain higher governmental or party positions are more likely to conform to the belief system of their party. Other workers have utilized the concept of "cross pressure" to explain party cohesion.

Flinn and Wirt (1965, p. 90) found that those who were cross pressured (i.e., whose group and individual ties were not politically consistent) were less likely to accept the party political belief system than others. Valen and Katz (1964, p. 250) and Eldersveld (1964, pp. 446-7, 201, 367, and 373) argue that the person who is involved in an effective party communication network is more likely to reflect his party's views on public policy.

So there is some research that has been done on ideology within party stratarchies. Much of it is sketchy and the studies on partisanship are contradictory. All of the published sources, except Valen and Katz (1964), utilized closed-ended Likert type summated scales to measure ideology. This does not permit the differentiation between issue consciousness and partisanship, two quite distinct aspects of ideology which are explained in detail below.

Psychological Traits

In the 1930's and 1940's political psychologists such as Harold Lasswell (1930 and 1946) argued that those who were active politically were basically individuals with fairly unsavory personalities. Only a person with low self-esteem, and basic distrust for his fellow men would take the unusual step of becoming active in politics.

Around 1950 The American Soldier (Stouffer et al. 1949) and The Authoritarian Personality (Adorno et al. 1950) were published. From that time political-psychological analysis began to turn from a priori and Freudian analysis to actual empirical investigation. In the two decades since then empirical evidence has accumulated which totally

reversed the early Lasswellian view (Milbrath 1965). Those who are involved in politics tend to be very high in self-esteem (Lane 1959). They also tend to be personally trustful, not cynical, and certainly not authoritarian (Presthus 1964, pp. 332-6; Agger, Goldstein, and Pearl 1961, p. 482; McClosky 1964, p. 374; Eldersveld 1964, pp. 319-30; and Harned 1961). Moreover, as Lane (1959, p. 164) and Sorauf (1968, p. 96) show, active partisans tend to be socially competent, gregarious, and extroverted. Those who are active in American party politics tend to be all of the things that Lasswell originally argued they were not. A study by Hennessy (1959) shows that party activists in Tucson, Arizona, are like those described in more recent research.

These traits of party activists could be partly accounted for by the fact that activists tend to be drawn from groups that have higher socioeconomic status than the general population. Alford and Scoble (1968), Ippolito (1969b) and Eldersveld (1964) found that the differences between political activists and voters is greater than would be predicted from SES data alone. Erbe (1964), on the other hand, found that educational differences alone accounted for the greater political alienation of voters. Party activists exhibit different psychological traits than mere voters, and such differences may be beyond SES differences.

While recent research has emphasized the ideological differences of Democrats and Republicans, the personality trait data indicate that members of both parties are basically the same in terms of these kinds of personality characteristics. Thus there is no relationship between such psychological variables and attitudes about public policy. Those

who have tried to make such a connection have made highly questionable assumptions (Lasswell 1930) or have used dubious methodology (McClosky 1958). Greenstein (1969, pp. 124-5), and Flinn and Wirt (1965, p. 86) specifically show that there is no such relationship.

Were the early pioneers in political psychology wrong, or did the nature of partisans change at the same time the ideological nature of the parties may have been changing? It is certainly possible that such changes did occur. Harned (1961) indicates that the old style political machine is much more congenial to "authoritarian types" than is the new style ideological party. In any case, the data clearly indicate that present day American political party activists are unusually trustful, self-confident people.

Party Expectations

Another psychological trait that has recently been discussed in political science is "professionalism." James Q. Wilson (1962) originally introduced this concept to the discipline as one way to look at expectations about the role parties should play. The professional is an individual who is concerned primarily with winning elections. He is willing to compromise, hide issues, stifle debates on the issues, or do anything else that will aid the party to victory. He is concerned with party harmony, but not with party ideology.

The amateur is primarily concerned with the party's ideology. He is willing to sacrifice victory to ideological purity, and believes in intraparty democracy and strong issue campaigning. Of course, these

are pure types. Most people in politics feel the need to balance off issue concern with concern for victory in elections. The distinction is one of degree.

Professionalism became the subject of heated discussion after 1964 when some political scientists argued that amateurs were essentially responsible for the nomination of Barry Goldwater for the Presidency by the Republicans (Polsby and Wildavsky 1966, pp. 169-183, 193, and 236). It is perhaps less debatable that the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1972 was given to George McGovern because those in control of the Democratic Convention were more concerned about issue purity than winning elections. Some scholarly work has been done in attempts to clarify this concept (Soule and Clarke 1970, Hofstetter 1971). Soule and Clarke in their study of national convention delegates argue that professionalism has four different dimensions as indicated by their factor analysis of questions drawn up to measure the basic concept itself. Their four dimensions were: "preoccupation with winning," "concern with intraparty democracy," "desire for programmatic parties," and "willingness to compromise." Hofstetter only found two dimensions in his study of Ohio political leaders: "issue participation," and "concern with intra-party democracy."

Psychological Traits, Party Expectations, and Stratarchies

Given the great concern in the discipline with psychological traits of party activists, it is surprising that so little work has been done to differentiate between those who occupy the various party strata. Soule and Clarke (1970, p. 892) show that those who have been in the

party for a long period of time, and those who have roots in the party through family ties are more professional than others. No other data have been brought to bear on the subject in published materials.

We know very little about differences in other personality traits between party activists, although there has been speculation about differences that might exist between candidates on the one hand, and party organization people on the other. Joyner (1971, p. 139) implies that the candidate is much more likely to exhibit characteristics that facilitate action in democratic settings such as flexibility, willingness to compromise, and tolerance of ambiguity. Barber (1965, pp. 223-4) argues that a candidate may be extraordinarily high or extraordinarily low in self-esteem.

The Variables

The Questionnaire used in this dissertation is reproduced as Appendix A. The location of the variables on the survey research instrument is indicated on Table 1.1.

Ideology

Four open-ended questions with associated probes have been constructed to measure ideology. The questions are similar to some written by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan and effectively utilized recently by David Repass (1971). This open-ended approach will allow the avoidance of non-attitudes (Converse 1964, 1970) and will avoid other pitfalls of closed-ended questions:

We might also observe that in presenting a battery of issue questions, the interviewer confronts the respondent with a series of statements that have been pre-selected and pre-worded

by a political analyst. Some respondents may not recognize the issue when it is presented to them in this manner--they themselves may view the issue in entirely different terms. Even more important, many respondents may be concerned with other issues besides those that are included in the interview schedule. These neglected issues may have a strong influence on the individual's voting behavior. . . (Repass 1971, p. 391).

In using an open-ended type of format, the respondents will be allowed to structure their own ideas, and present those issues that seem most relevant to them. Other authors have suggested this type of format to tap ideology. Among them are Barnes (1966), McPhee, Anderson, and Milholland (1962), p. 91, Hennessy (1970), and Lehnert (1968). Milbrath (1968, pp. 32-3), and Wilker and Milbrath (1970) suggest another less open approach, but their battery of questions does not meet Converse's basic objections to the way ideology has been traditionally measured.

In evaluating these open-ended questions, all responses will be considered together. It does not matter whether an issue was mentioned as a response to the first question or to the last one. The important thing is that it is mentioned at all. The four questions are merely a framework in which to elicit a sample of attitudes from the ideology of the respondents. The answers will not give a complete picture of the respondent's political belief system. Not every attitude or opinion of every respondent will be elicited; but non-attitudes will not be given, since the respondents must volunteer information on each issue. In the aggregate those issues that are mentioned are among the most important to the respondents, and that is in itself an important datum.

Issue Consciousness. The first ideological variable that will be measured by this set of questions is the number of different issues

TABLE 1.1

GUIDE TO POSITION OF VARIABLES IN QUESTIONNAIRE

VARIABLES MEASURED	NUMBERED POSITION ON QUESTIONNAIRE
IDEOLOGY	34 through 37
SHORT DOGMATISM SCALE	40, 42, 46, 51, 55, 57, 59, 61, 65
MACHIAVELLIANISM, MACH IV--	
Duplicity	39, 48, 50, 52, 54, 71
Negativism	38, 44, 56, 58, 60, 64
Distrust of People	45, 53, 62, 67
PROFESSIONALISM/PARTY EXPECTATIONS	
General items	61, 69
Preoccupation with winning	66
Concern with intraparty democracy	47, 68
Desire for programmatic parties	41, 73
Willingness to compromise	43, 49, 70
PARTY EXPERIENCE	
Party	1
Position in the stratararchy	2
Party balance in precinct	3
Number of campaigns worked	8, 9
Kind of party experience	10, 11
Self described role	12
Competition faced within party	13
Commitment to present position	14
Ambition	15
Self described import. of politics	16
Hours per week spent campaigning	17
Hours per week spent on politics	18
Self estimate of future activity	19
Assessment of party communication	20
Party loyalty as a worker	21, 22, 23
Party loyalty as a voter	24, 25, 26
Political support at work	27
Political support at home	28
Proclivity to join groups	29, 30
Political heritage	31, 32, 33
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS	6, 7, 74 through 78

or government policies mentioned by the respondent in the course of the interview. The more policies a respondent can mention, the more conscious of issues he is. The respondents were not restricted in terms of how many issues and government policies they could discuss. They could continue as long as they wished. Some restrictions did have to be placed on the number of non-specific responses that would be counted in a single policy area. For example, the idea: "We must close tax loopholes," is counted as one response. If the respondent then adds: "We must be tougher on the rich," this was not counted as a second idea. The respondent could get another point on the issue of tax reform by adding: "We should end the oil depletion allowance." He could get another point by saying: "And we should also tax interest income the same as other income." In each policy area, only one "general" statement could be counted toward the issue consciousness score, but each specific policy statement was counted.

Partisanship. This is a measure of the extent to which the respondents agree with their party cohorts about what government should do and should not do, and the extent to which they support office holders in their own party. To construct this scale it is necessary to determine the partisan issues. A partisan issue is defined as: A dispute involving government policy: 1) Which is mentioned by at least three respondents in each party; 2) in which a majority of the Democrats who mention the issue take a position which is directly opposite from, or logically inconsistent with, a position taken by a majority of the Republicans who mention the issue; and 3) in which more Democrats take the Democratic position than Republicans and more Republicans take the

Republican position than Democrats. Each respondent started with a neutral score of fifty. An individual received two points if he took his party's position on a partisan issue. He lost two points if he took the opposition party's position on an issue. He gained one point for each different remark which praised a politician from his own party or a legislative body controlled by his own party. He gained one point if he criticized a politician in the opposite party or a legislative body controlled by the opposition. He lost one point each time he criticized politicians or legislative bodies controlled by his own party or praised the opposition.

Dogmatism

Dogmatism was developed as a unidimensional trait that is common to both extremists of the right and the left (Rokeach 1960). It has been tested extensively, and found to be a useful tool in the study of personality (Robinson and Shaver 1969, pp. 334-352). As both Rokeach (1960) and Robinson and Shaver (1969) point out, a person who is dogmatic would be uncomfortable in the give and take atmosphere of democracy. He would prefer a more highly structured and hierarchical setting in which he would follow a trusted leader unquestioningly and expect the same blind obedience from those beneath him.

Dogmatism is one of those personality or psychological variables that are thought to have deep roots in the individual's psyche as Smith, Bruner, and White (1956) indicate and as Rokeach (1968) has more recently reiterated. It will be treated here as simply a measure of attitudes toward life and people in general.

For this study the ten item "Short Dogmatism Scale" was selected. It does not have quite the depth and range of the longer versions of this scale, but its brevity makes it much easier to administer in a lengthy questionnaire such as the one used here.

Machiavellianism

Machiavellianism is allegedly a measure of the extent to which individuals have attitudes like those lauded by the Renaissance Italian philosopher of the same name. It is a trait that is measured by a battery of questions constructed by the Columbia School of Social Research (Christie and Geis 1970), and has been used extensively by social psychologists at Columbia and elsewhere on selected samples used in laboratory experiments.

The particular variant of the scale which is used here is called "Mach IV," or the fourth version used at Columbia. It has three factors or dimensions according to Christie and Geis (1970).

Duplicity. This is a measure of the individual's desire and willingness to manipulate other people. It is an indication of the extent to which a person is willing to be devious in his dealings with others. A duplicitous person is flexible and ingratiating, always ready to use other people.

Negativism. Cynicism is another word for this variable. The person who scores highly on this scale thinks the entire world is a suspicious place. Robinson and Shaver (1969) present many scales which measure traits quite similar to negativism. Many of the specific items

in the scale have very similar wording to most other "cynicism" and "negativism" scales used by social scientists.

Distrust of People. This trait appears to be one of the old familiar ideas of survey research. Morris Rosenberg's "misanthropy," is a strikingly similar idea (1955, 1956, 1957), and Robinson and Shaver (1969) present many scales that measure essentially the same trait. The notion involved here is that whether individuals feel that they can place their confidence in people is important to understanding their relationships with others.

Political theorists often debate whether Machiavelli was "realistic" or just "evil." While this is an interesting question, it is not one which will be dealt with here. This study is only interested in whether those who occupy different parts of the party stratarchy differ in the extent to which they share Machiavelli's attitudes toward the world and other people. This is important for understanding the party system, because it may determine how political leaders deal with each other and with the masses. Machiavelli had specific ideas about how political leaders should (or are forced) to deal with others. Those who believe democratic politics is both possible and desirable have a different set of ideals. Christie and Geis (1970, chapter XVII) claim that those who score high in machiavellianism are more likely to be successful in inter-person face to face unstructured situations. High and low "Mach" scorers do not perform differently in more structured situations. Most of those who have used other measures of "negativism" or "distrust of people" have found that in real life situations distrustful negative persons do not perform well in groups (see the various measures in

Robinson and Shaver 1969). Whether party activists are more or less machiavellian than voters is not at issue here. The question is: Are there stratarchy differences in this trait?

Party Expectations

Attitudes toward the role of the party are examined using the concept of "professionalism." The measure of professionalism comes essentially from Soule and Clarke (1970). The questions they devised have been altered slightly to straight Likert type questions.

As noted above (page 16) Soule and Clarke found four dimensions or factors in professionalism.

Preoccupation with Winning. A single question in Soule and Clarke's questionnaire measured the extent to which the individual considers winning elections to be the paramount object of politics. The "professional" would respond that winning is indeed the most important goal of the party. The "amateur" would question that assumption.

Concern with Intraparty Democracy. The amateur desires more discussion and free democratic give and take within the counsels of his own party. This does not mean that he necessarily wishes to downgrade interparty democracy. The professional considers interparty democracy to be the only competition necessary. He prefers the party to operate as a close knit "family" that does not "air its dirty linen in public."

Desire for Programmatic Parties. The professional, whose primary goal is winning elections, does not concern himself with problems of ideology. The amateur, however, wants to make his party an ideologically pure policy making tool. The amateur thinks the party should

take a position on all issues in a forthright manner. The professional would rather obfuscate issues if that gets votes.

Willingness to Compromise. If there is anything that the professional in party circles is good at, it is compromising. He is even willing to compromise on ideology in order to gain votes. The amateur holds his ideology to be inviolable. To him compromise on issues is a sin. The amateur believes a politician should state his own personal views on the issues and allow the voter to choose candidates on that basis. The professional would rather see the candidate adjust to the views of the voters than the other way around.

It is easy to see why professionalism is an important concept to use to examine attitudes toward the role of parties. As with dogmatism and machiavellianism, these are attitudes that might determine how the activist deals with his political world. These attitudes may shape the manner in which the party worker or leader deals with other politicians and with the public.

Party Experience

Normally, political scientists are interested in attitudes because they help account for behavior. Studies of this type employ at least some measures of actual behavior which can be explained or accounted for by attitudes. In this study it is reported activities in party work which are the behavioral variables. Twenty party experience variables have been selected for use in this study.

Party. The literature would seem to indicate that there are no significant differences between the Republicans and Democrats on belief

system variables. The one exception to this might be partisanship. McClosky et al. 1960, and Nexon 1971, have found that Republicans are more partisan than Democrats. These findings are based on national samples and are quite likely to be biased by the regional differences that are much more prominent within the Democratic Party (Arrington, 1972).

Position in the Stratarchy. The actual position held by the respondent at the time of the interview is used as a party experience variable. There are four possible positions: 1) novice, 2) executive committeeman, 3) unsuccessful candidate for the state legislature, and 4) successful candidate for the state legislature. These various positions will be discussed in detail below.

Party Balance in Precinct. The percentage of the 1972 two-party vote cast for the respondent's Presidential candidate in his precinct was coded. This is a measure of the partisan characteristics of the neighborhood in which the respondent lives.

Number of Campaigns Worked. This scale is a measure of the length of time the respondent has been involved in party work. An individual who never worked in campaigns before 1972 was given a score of "1" on this variable. Those who had worked in 1970 received a "2" and so forth.

Kind of Party Experiences. The highest political position ever held by the respondent was coded. It is assumed that public office is "higher" in some sense than party office. This scale is treated as an ordinal measure, whereas position in the stratarchy is nominal. Kind of party experience varies from those who have never held a party office

and never even run for public office (scored "1") up to those who have held public office for more than two years (scored "7").

Self Described Role. This measure has been dichotomized. One group is made up of those who gave an "other oriented" reason for involvement in politics. These individuals said that they wished to promote an ideology, or "help people," or promote "better government." The second group of respondents gave "self oriented" reasons for involvement. They said that they "enjoyed politics," or got involved for business or career goals.

Competition Faced within Party. This scale measures the seriousness of the opposition within the respondent's party to his candidacy for whatever position he held at the time of the interview. Those who faced what they considered "serious opposition" scored high on the variable, and those who were unopposed scored low.

Commitment to Present Position. This variable can be considered as a simple measure of ambition. Those who do not wish to run for their present office again score low on this variable. Those who wish to desert their present position for a "higher" position get a high score.

Ambition. A measure of desire for higher office seemed relevant to party experience. This variable is not a measure of the difference between the respondent's present position and the position he would like to attain. It is, rather, a measure of how "high" in politics he wishes to go. Again it is assumed that public office is in some sense "higher" than party office. Thus a person who wishes to be Governor some day receives a higher score than one who wishes to be State Party Chairman.

This assumption is based on the notion of greater political commitment by candidates which was discussed above (page 10). It is also assumed that state office is "higher" than local office, Federal office is "higher" than state office, elected office is "higher" than appointed office, and executive office is "higher" than legislative office within the same level of government.

Self Described Importance of Politics. This is nothing more than the respondent's own evaluation of how important politics and political activity are to him personally. A low score means that politics is not important to the respondent.

Hours per Week Spent Campaigning. The respondent's own estimate of how many hours per week he spends campaigning during the last weeks before a presidential election is utilized for this scale.

Hours per Week Spent on Politics. In order to get a full picture of the extent of the respondents' activities, they were also asked how many hours per week they spent on political activity during non-campaign periods. State legislators were asked to disregard their time during the state legislative session which is virtually twenty-four hours per day.

Self Estimate of Future Activity. Those who said their political activity would increase in the future scored high ("3") on this variable, and those who said their activity would decrease scored low ("1").

Assessment of Party Communication. A person who reports good communication with others in the party is given a high score on this variable. Those who don't consider the party communication network to

be very good are given low scores. This is thus an attempt to get an idea of how well each respondent communicates with others in the party.

Party Loyalty as a Worker. This is another dichotomous variable. Those who reported that they did (or would have) deserted their party when it nominated a radical candidate (i.e., Barry Goldwater for the Republicans in 1964 and George McGovern for the Democrats in 1972) are separated from those who report that they were (or would have been) loyal to their party.

Party Loyalty as a voter. A second party loyalty measure is included in the study. It is also a dichotomous variable, which separates those who reported having split their ticket in any one of several recent elections from those who reported always voting a straight ticket.

Political Support at Work. The notion of "cross pressure" in determining political behavior was first enunciated by Lazarsfeld, Barelson, and Gaudet (1944). This variable is an attempt to apply the concept in this study. Those who score high on this variable are those who report that others at their place of work have the same partisan loyalties as the respondent. Those who score low are the ones who reported being cross pressured at work.

Political Support at Home. This variable is also based on cross pressure theory. Those who report that their immediate family cross pressures them are the ones who receive the low score on this measure.

Proclivity to Join Groups. An individual who joins many clubs and organizations outside the party receives a high score on this variable. A person who is not much of a "joiner" receives a low score.

Political Heritage. The last of the twenty party experience variables, heritage, is a measure of the extent to which the respondent's parents had partisan loyalties that were the same as his own and the extent to which they were active politically. The lowest score on this scale is given to those whose parents are in the opposite political party. The highest score is for those whose parents were active in the respondent's own party.

Socioeconomic Status

Seven standard socioeconomic variables are used in this study. They are: Sex, ethno/race, age, occupational status, income, religion, and educational attainment. All of these except ethno/race are so standard throughout social research that they do not require explanation. There are five ethnic groups in Arizona: Anglos, Mexicans, blacks, Indians, and orientals. Only the first three are present among the Pima County political party elites. The ethno/race variable has been dichotomized into "white" and "non-white." The latter includes the ten Mexicans and the two blacks included among the respondents.

The Sample

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was administered to a sample of eighty political leaders and workers in Tucson, Arizona. The interviews were given by the author between 9 November and 26 December 1972. Each interview lasted from twenty-five minutes to two hours, depending on the issue consciousness of the respondent. Interviews were given to the respondents in places of business, homes, University offices, a liquor store, or any place else a respondent agreed to be interviewed. The

respondents were cooperative and helpful without exception. Out of the original sample only two refused to be interviewed, while three could not be contacted. These five were replaced with randomly selected alternates to fill out the sample sizes as indicated in Table 1.2. All of the non-contacts were political novices. Virtually no one refused to respond to any of the questions, and all were good sports about answering some rather personal inquiries.

Candidates: As can be seen from Table 1.2, four strata from each political party are sampled in this study. The first strata is successful candidates for public office. The second is unsuccessful candidates. The Democrats had fifteen nominees for the state legislature in 1972 in the Tucson urban area. All fifteen of these individuals were interviewed. The Republicans only had thirteen legislative nominees, so two candidates for the Pima County Board of Supervisors were included to fill out the Republican part of the sample. It was a fortunate coincidence that both samples turned out to have nine successful and six unsuccessful candidates.

Committeemen: The Republican Executive Committee and District Chairmen numbered seventeen. With the help of some long time party workers, the names of newcomers to politics and former candidates for public office were removed from this list. This left ten Executive Committee members, all of whom were interviewed. The Democrats had more than eighteen Executive Committee members and District Chairmen, but only that number had been elected to office by the deadline for selecting this sample (shortly before the 1972 election). Again, with the help of old political pros, the names of new people and former

TABLE 1.2
THE SIZE OF THE SAMPLES

POSITION IN THE PARTY STRATARCHY	NUMBER OF DEMOCRATS	NUMBER OF REPUBLICANS
SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES	9	9
UNSUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES	6	6
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEEMEN	10	10
NOVICES	15	15
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	40	40

candidates were removed from the list, and from the remaining names a sample of ten were drawn by the method recommended by Blalock (1960, pp. 393-6). These people represented "old timers," or people who had been in party work for a long time, but were not themselves candidates for public office.

Novices: The fourth strata that is sampled is new people just entering party work. To draw this sample a list of all the delegates and alternates to both parties' state nominating conventions was made. (These conventions selected delegates for the national conventions.) The names of everyone who had been a candidate or any kind of party office holder since 1966 were then removed. From the original lists, which had well over one hundred fifty names for each party, the removal of those with previous party experience left twenty-five Democrat newcomers and seventeen Republican novices. These smaller samples were reduced to fifteen for each party by Blalock's random selection method.

These selection methods are designed to assure that four types of political activists (novices, committeemen, successful candidates, and unsuccessful candidates) are represented, and that a wide variation in party experience will be present in the sample. The party experience measures, other than position in the stratarchy, may or may not be more closely related to the attitudinal variables.

These various groups do not form a hierarchy. There is no legal or cultural norm that makes candidates "higher" or "lower" than the Executive Committee or State Convention of the party. The various groups (candidates, Executive Committee, and State Convention) are separate and unrelated in any chain of command sense. The assumption of

rank made for some of the party experience variables is based on the research of political scientists (Joyner 1971, Barber 1965) and has no foundation in the norms of either party (Eldersveld 1964).

This kind of examination of a local political party structure is becoming quite common in political science. More intensive study of the older data gained from national samples cannot really give information on political elites as Sorauf points out (1964, p. 177). Generalization from local data can be a very fruitful alternative approach as Valen and Katz (1964, p. 266) argue. These samples may not be representative of the entire party structure in Tucson. They certainly are not representative of the party structure anywhere else. When we find that those who occupy different strata in the Tucson party are different in attitudes, ideology, or any other characteristic, we may be justified in assuming that such differences also exist between strata personnel in other areas throughout the country where party structure and environmental variables are essentially similar to Tucson. The factors which produce differences between strata personnel in Tucson (or produce similarity) are probably acting elsewhere to produce such differences (or similarities.) The absolute amounts of these variables--issue consciousness or professionalism, for example--are not really important. We cannot generalize to any larger population from such data. The finding that candidates are more professional or more issue consciousness (to take two examples) than those who occupy the party organization is a significant result. We can generalize such a finding to other parties in America.

Statistical Methods

All of the variables utilized in this study will be treated as ordinal variables except position in the stratararchy, which will be treated as a nominal variable. Freeman (1965, chapter 5) describes an ordinal scale as one in which the data is placed into groups which can be ordered from "high" to "low" or from "less" to "more" of some quantity or characteristic, but no uniform distance between the groups on the scale can be assumed. Essentially nominal variables that can be dichotomized may be treated as ordinal variables. In this study all dichotomized measures are treated as ordinal level variables.

Position in the stratararchy will be treated as a nominal variable, because the various groups (committeemen, novices, unsuccessful candidates, and successful candidates) are different from each other, but cannot be placed on any scale from higher to lower (Freeman 1965, chapter 4). Indeed, the very idea that American political parties are stratararchies rather than hierarchies implies that position is a nominal variable (Lasswell and Kaplan 1950, pp. 219-220). However, it is possible to assume that certain kinds of activities require more work, responsibility, and commitment from individuals. Kind of party experience, which is really an elaborated version of position in the stratararchy, will be treated as an ordinal scale in this study by making such an assumption. For this variable it is assumed that public office is "higher" than party office, and central committee work is "higher" than mere attendance at a state convention.

Ordinal variables will be related to other ordinal variables using the statistic called gamma (or G). When relating two dichotomized

variables the Yule's Q statistic will be used. Q is exactly the same as gamma, except it is applied only to a 2 x 2 table (Costner 1965, p. 346). Freeman (1965, chapter 8) describes the gamma statistic in great detail, and more theoretical information on it is available from its inventors Goodman and Kruskal (1954). It is a summation of the success one would have in predicting an individual's relative position or rank in one ordinal scale from his rank or position in another. Like most statistical measures of association it goes from a +1.0 (perfect positive correspondence between the two scales) to -1.0 (perfect negative correspondence between them). A gamma of .00 means no relationship at all between the variables. Gamma is essentially a ratio of the amount of agreement between the two sets of rankings. It can thus be seen as "percentage agreement" between two scales, and is a direct measure of proportional reduction in error roughly equivalent to Pearson's r^2 (Costner, 1965).

To relate position in the stratarchy to the other variables, the statistic eta will be used (Freeman 1965, chapter 11). Eta is customarily a measure of the relation of a nominal variable to an interval variable. It can also be used to relate ordinal to nominal without violating a proper use of the statistic. Eta is interpreted in the same way as the Pearsonian r. Eta^2 is the "percentage of variation" in the ordinal variable that can be "explained" by the nominal variable.

"Meaningful" relationships between variables in this study are defined as gamma or eta relationships of .30 or better. Such a restriction is essentially arbitrary. It is necessary if findings are not to be trivial or spurious. A gamma or eta of .30 or better for these

samples would be significant statistically at the .05 level. Statistical significance is not important here, because the critical concern is the amount of variation explained.

Research Questions

The purpose of this dissertation is to see how the strata of Tucson political parties differ in : 1) ideology, 2) expectations about the role of political parties, 3) dogmatism, 4) machiavellianism, and 5) socioeconomic status. In every case except SES the idea is to relate party behavior (one or more of the twenty measures of party experience) to the belief system variables.

Chapter two: The relationship of party experience to both issue consciousness and partisanship is the subject of the next chapter of this study. The various aspects of party experience are tested to see if one or more of them is more highly related to ideological variables than the others. For example, what relates most highly to issue consciousness, running for public office or being in the party for a long time? What makes a person conform to the party's ideology, being in the party for many years or working long hours for the party for a few years?

Chapter three: Expectations about the role of political parties and the concept of professionalism are the subject of this chapter. It is quite relevant to ask how different kinds of party work and experience affects such attitudes. Are candidates really more willing to compromise as some authors insist because they must face the public? Does long experience in the party make people more desirous of

programmatic parties? Are newcomers more likely to want more democracy in party councils? These are some of the questions answered in this chapter.

Chapter four: Party experience variables are related to dogmatism and machiavellianism in this chapter. Here again, the various measures of experience are compared to determine which ones associate most highly with the belief system variables. Are candidates for public office less dogmatic than those in the party organization? Does party work in general demand a machiavellian approach to life so that those who have been in such work for a long time will necessarily be more like the politicians praised by Machiavelli?

Chapter five: Socioeconomic status is examined in the next to last chapter of this study. There is considerable research that indicates that there is no relationship between party experience and SES. This chapter should show if this holds true in Tucson.

Chapter six: This concluding chapter summarizes the dissertation and discusses the implications of the findings for political science and American politics.

CHAPTER 2

IDEOLOGY AND PARTY EXPERIENCE

This chapter explores the relationship between party experience and the two ideological variables, issue consciousness and partisanship. It is divided into four major sections. The first section of this chapter outlines the interrelationships of the party experience variables. Following that is an examination of the results obtained from the ideology questions. The next two sections of the chapter are concerned with the relationships between ideology and party experience. The last section is a summary.

Party Experience Variables

Because of the sampling methods used for this study, a wide variation exists within the sample on all of the party experience variables. Most of these scales display a normal, even distribution (i.e., the scales are not skewed). However, there is a distribution problem with three of the party experience variables. Party loyalty as a worker is the first of these. Only twelve individuals in the sample reported having deserted their party when it nominated a radical candidate (Goldwater in 1964 for the Republicans and McGovern in 1972 for the Democrats). Similarly, in the measure of party loyalty as a voter, fourteen respondents reported having voted against their party in any one of several recent elections. Despite efforts to include a wide

variety of different kinds of party activists, the sample is made up almost exclusively of party stalwarts. The party worker who deserts his party in Tucson is rare.

Political support at home is the third party experience variable which has a distribution problem. Only twelve individuals reported that their family was not in complete accord with their partisan attachments. Ten of these said that some members of their family were in the opposite party, and two reported that all the other members of their family were in the opposition. Family partisanship appears to be a common trait among activists in Tucson.

These distribution problems are important in the analysis that is given below. The gamma is sensitive to small frequencies on the diagonals. For this reason, some variables cannot be compared in this analysis because the low frequencies make the gamma unreliable. In the tables given below, such cases are marked with an appropriate footnote so that the reader will not be misled.

There are some interrelationships between the twenty party experience variables that are equal to or greater than .30. However, there are not as many of these as one might expect. There is no variable that consistently is associated with all of the other party experience variables. Thus there are several different aspects of party experience that are measured by these twenty variables.

Position in the stratarchy is the measure associated most consistently with the other party experience variables. Position is meaningfully related to eleven of the nineteen other variables. Table 2.1 shows the relationship between position and these eleven other variables.

TABLE 2.1
 RELATIONSHIP OF POSITION IN THE STRATARCHY
 TO SOME OTHER PARTY EXPERIENCE VARIABLES^a

PARTY EXPERIENCE VARIABLE	NOVICES	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEEMEN	UNSUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES	SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES
PARTY BALANCE IN PRECINCT (median scale score)	4.2	5.5	2.5	6.5
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED (median number)	2.0	5.5	4.5	7.1
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE (percent ideological)	43%	45%	83%	78%
AMBITION (median scale score)	2.5	2.3	4.3	4.5
SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS (median score)	3.0	3.9	3.9	4.5
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAM- PAIGNING (median score)	2.3	5.8	7.2	6.9
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT ON POLITICS (median score)	1.2	4.5	3.5	6.7
ASSESSMENT OF PARTY COM- MUNICATION (median score)	3.3	5.5	3.8	3.4
PARTY LOYALTY AS A WORKER (% who deserted their party)	7%	5%	33%	28%
PARTY LOYALTY AS A VOTER (% who split their ticket)	10%	15%	33%	22%
PROCLIVITY TO JOIN GROUPS (median score)	2.3	4.6	5.5	5.5
N=	(30)	(20)	(12)	(18)

^aThe eta relationship between each of these variables and position in the stratarchy is greater than .30.

Examination of this table reveals what kind of people occupy the various strata of the Tucson political parties.

Party balance in precinct: It is not surprising that there is a relationship between party balance and position. Unsuccessful candidates tend to come from areas where their party is in the minority. This is, after all, how they came to be unsuccessful.

Number of campaigns worked: Novices are the group with the least experience. This is an intentional result of the sampling methods used. Successful candidates are much more likely to have long term experience than unsuccessful ones. This is quite possibly the result of recruitment and primary competition for office. Those with long term experience edge out newcomers for the legislative positions where their party is likely to be victorious. Newcomers may find little primary competition from the oldtimers for seats that their party is sure to lose.

Self described role: The relationship of this variable to position is quite different than would be expected from much of the literature on political parties. Authors such as James Barber (1965) and Leon Epstein (1967) have indicated that candidates get personal satisfaction from office holding, and those in the party organization must subsist on ideological rewards. Table 2.1 shows that it is the candidates who are predominantly willing to describe their reasons for involvement in politics in ideological terms, not the party organization personnel.

Ambition: Candidates are much more ambitious than either novices or committeemen. Perhaps the latter groups are reluctant to admit to dreams.

Self described importance of politics; Successful candidates are the most likely to consider politics to be personally important to them and novices are the least likely to be concerned with politics.

Hours per week spent campaigning: Candidates are the ones who spent the most time campaigning, according to the data on Table 2.1. The real differences are between novices, who spend very little time campaigning; and the other three groups, who score highly on this scale. Successful candidates campaigned a little less than unsuccessful ones. This can be attributed to the fact that several candidates in each party were unopposed in the general election.

Hours per week spent on politics: The observable pattern for hours spent on politics during the entire year is different than the pattern on campaign time. Again the novices were the least involved. Here, however, executive committeemen actually spent more time on politics during most of the year than unsuccessful candidates. The legislators are the ones who consistently spent the greatest amount of time on political affairs, even discounting their full time service during the legislative session.

Assessment of party communication: Executive committeemen report having the best communications with others in the party. It is interesting to speculate about why unsuccessful candidates have more party contacts than those who become elected. Perhaps a potential loser has more need for formal help from the party organization than an incumbent who has his own personal organization, or perhaps the incumbent may regard the formal party organization as something of an organizational rival.

Party loyalty: Both the measures of party loyalty show that it is candidates who are most likely to desert their party. Novices and committeemen are much more likely to stick to the party in rain or shine.

Proclivity to join groups: The last variable on Table 2.1 shows that candidates for public office are most likely to join groups outside the party. Novices are much less likely to be joiners than the members of the other groups.

Measuring Ideology

Issue Consciousness

In chapter one the methods for measuring issue consciousness are outlined. It is necessary here to report the success that was achieved with these methods. In response to the four open-ended ideology questions, the party activists gave 2,701 codable ideas about what government should and should not do. (All the responses and their frequencies within each party are listed in Appendix B.) The median was thirty-two responses for each individual interviewed. The lowest number of responses was thirteen and the highest number was sixty. The distribution was spread quite regularly over that entire field with very few clusters. The modal response (forty-four) was given by only seven respondents.

Table 2.2 shows the areas of policy that were mentioned by the respondents in each party. There were not many differences between the parties in terms of the issues that were of concern. Republicans were a little more likely to express opinions about state-federal relations and

TABLE 2.2

RANK ORDERING OF THE ISSUE AREAS MENTIONED
IN RESPONSE TO THE FOUR IDEOLOGY QUESTIONS

ISSUE AREA	DEMOCRATS	REPUBLICANS
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND HUMAN WELFARE	22%	16%
CRIME AND DRUGS	12	14
DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY	11	10
POLLUTION AND LAND PLANNING	9	12
THE ECONOMY, BUSINESS REGULATION, CONSUMER AFFAIRS, AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDIES	10	9
TRANSPORTATION	5	6
TAXES	4	4
JUDICIARY, SUPREME COURT, THE CONSTITUTION	4	2
STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONS	1	5
RACE	3	2
WOMEN'S LIBERATION	2	2
OTHER FEDERAL ISSUES OR COMMENTS	6	5
OTHER STATE ISSUES OR COMMENTS	5	7
OTHER LOCAL ISSUES OR COMMENTS	6	7
TOTAL	100%	101% ^a
N =	(1,389)	(1,312)

^aFigure exceeds 100 because of rounding.

less likely to comment on domestic human welfare type issues. Republicans averaged 32.6 responses each, Democrats 33.0.

For the analysis used in this study, the issue consciousness raw scores were converted into an ordinal scale with eight groups of about ten respondents each.

Partisanship

One should not assume from the data on Table 2.2 that the members of the two parties think alike on political issues. By using the methods outlined in chapter one, it is possible to distinguish seventeen partisan issues from the responses to the open-ended questions. The issues, and the numbers of respondents giving them, are found in Table 2.3. These issues are the disputes around which the 1972 election had centered. Most of them are national issues, but many of the most clearly partisan ones are state or local in origin (e.g., the dispute over the Farm Labor Act). The partisan issues cover a varied range of topics. They include foreign and domestic concerns, disputes over the courts and the executive, and racial issues. These are not necessarily the only partisan issues that divide the Tucson political parties, but they were the only ones that met the stringent tests set forth in chapter one. They are very likely, therefore, the most important partisan issues that existed in Tucson following the 1972 elections.

The partisanship scores derived from these partisan issues and miscellaneous comments about political leaders and legislative bodies range from a low of forty-six to a high of seventy-four. Only one respondent took the opposition party position more often than that of his

TABLE 2.3

PARTISAN ISSUES DERIVED FROM THE RESPONSES TO THE FOUR IDEOLOGY QUESTIONS

ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE OF THE RESPONSES	NUMBER OF DEMOCRATS	NUMBER OF REPUBLICANS
THE STATE FARM LABOR ACT		
In favor of the act	0	13
Against the act	20	0
THE POLICE HELICOPTER		
In favor of the helicopter	5	7
Against the helicopter	6	1
CRIME		
Supreme Court decisions cause crime, stiffer sentences and more convictions are needed	5	15
Poverty and drugs responsible for crime, Miranda and rights of accused decisions are good	6	1
DEFENSE		
Must have a strong or a stronger defense posture	1	10
Cut defense drastically, don't emphasize defense	21	3
FOREIGN AID		
Make foreign aid more effective and/or increase it	7	2
Decrease or end foreign aid	3	6
SOCIALIZED MEDICINE		
Support the Kennedy-English method of medicine or will support "anything"	12	0
Support the Nixon-Australian method of medicine or want "nothing"	0	10
THE ECONOMY		
Wage/Price guidelines must be enforced more strictly, control prices and profits more	11	1
Support the guidelines as they are or end them totally, or cut the Federal budget	2	16
SELECTION OF JUDGES		
Favors electing judges	5	0
Favors appointing judges	1	4
THE SUPREME COURT		
Support the Warren Court and/or condemn the Burger Court	8	0
Support the Burger Court and/or condemn the Warren Court	0	4

TABLE 2.3 (CONTINUED)

ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE OF THE RESPONSES	NUMBER OF DEMOCRATS	NUMBER OF REPUBLICANS
LABOR UNIONS		
Unions need support, repeal the right-to-work law	6	0
Must be tougher on unions, apply anti-trust to them, more N.L.R.B. regulation needed	0	8
BUSSING TO ACHIEVE RACIAL BALANCE IN SCHOOLS		
In favor of bussing	4	0
Against bussing	2	12
RACE		
Government must do more or keep up activity to promote equality for blacks and Mexicans	11	1
"Reverse discrimination" is occurring, quotas are wrong, the courts have gone too far	2	5
STATES RIGHTS		
The government, especially the Federal Government, should do more in general	5	1
The government, especially the Federal Government, should do less or turn more over to the States	3	13
FEDERAL TAXES		
Close tax loopholes, make the income tax more progressive, raise taxes	11	1
Taxes should not be too progressive, cut taxes or leave the income tax as it is	0	6
STATE TAXES		
To replace the property tax, raise only corporate income taxes and severance taxes	8	1
To replace the property tax, raise all taxes	2	14
VIETNAM		
Get out now, with no other goals specified	24	4
Support the President's policies, get out with honor, or other more hawkish position	3	17
WELFARE		
Give more welfare benefits/and or make the rules less strict so that more people qualify for relief	15	3
Give fewer welfare benefits and/or make the rules more strict so that cheaters will get off	5	14

own party. This individual is an unsuccessful Republican candidate of Mexican background. His legislative district is in the heart of the barrio of Tucson. He received the low score (forty-six). Three respondents received scores of fifty, which means that they are completely non-partisan on these issues. Two of these people are Democratic candidates and one is a Republican candidate. The other seventy-six respondents received scores which indicate that they were partisans. The median, modal, and mean score on partisanship is fifty-eight. Republicans average fifty-eight, Democrats fifty-nine.

For use in this study the raw partisanship scores were converted into an ordinal scale with eight groups of about ten respondents each.

Both ideological variables are based on the results of the same four open-ended questions. Thus there is a danger that these might be two measures of the same phenomenon. This is, however, not the case. There is no meaningful relation between issue consciousness and partisanship. The gamma association between the two variables is .22. They are distinct, different variables.

Party Experience and Issue Consciousness

The relations between the party experience variables and issue consciousness are presented on table 2.4. This table (and the seven others like it in this study) appear more formidable than they really are. Each one is a summary of the affect on the associations between the twenty party experience variables and a single attitudinal measure, of controlling for selected party experience variables. For example, Table 2.4 shows the association between issue consciousness and each of

TABLE 2.4

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ISSUE CONSCIOUSNESS AND PARTY EXPERIENCE
CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

	ENTIRE SAMPLE	PARTY		POSITION IN STRATARCHY			NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED		AMBITION		SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS		HOURS PER WEEK SPENT	
		DEMOS	REPUBS	NOVICE	COMMITTEE	CANDIDATES	FEW	MANY	LITTLE	ALOT	LITTLE	ALOT	FEW	MANY
PARTY	-.04			-.18	(.47)	(.47)	-.08	.01	-.11	.10	-.14	.09	-.29	.22
POSITION	(.42) ^a	.20 ^a	(.40) ^a				.17 ^a	(.34) ^a	.14 ^a	.19 ^a	.16 ^a	.05 ^a	.11 ^a	(.31) ^a
PARTY BALANCE IN PRECINCT	.01	-.02	.02	.01	-.15	.08	-.19	.18	.10	.02	.00	.02	.04	-.03
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED	.06	.04	.18	.13	.16	-.08			.11	-.05	.10	.00	.11	.09
KIND OF PARTY EXPERIENCE	.04	-.04	.16	.05	-.15	-.01	.04	.08	.12	-.13	.20	-.12	.11	.00
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE	.17	(.33)	-.01	.05	(.47)	-.09	.29	.04	(.35)	-.11	(.31)	.02	.07	(.32)
COMPETITION FACED WITHIN PARTY	.01	-.06	-.03	.16	.12	-.21	-.10	.16	.05	-.05	.10	-.07	.24	-.20
COMMITMENT TO PRESENT POSITION	.09	-.14	(.32)	.07	.11	.07	.01	.19	-.04	.00	.07	.00	.20	-.02
AMBITION	(.38)	(.34)	(.44)	(.36)	(.53)	(.44)	(.38)	(.40)			(.31)	(.43)	(.39)	(.43)
SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS	.20	.13	(.32)	.15	.18	(.32)	.11	(.40)	.08	.11			(.31)	.20
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	.04	-.10	.21	.06	.05	-.08	.05	.08	.10	-.17	.13	-.13		
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT ON POLITICS	.14	.06	.26	.26	-.04	.16	.12	.24	.15	.05	.25	.04	(.35)	.13
SELF ESTIMATE OF FUTURE ACTIVITY	.26	.09	(.40)	.24	(.46)	.06	.28	.27	-.06	.18	(.35)	.11	(.31)	.15
ASSESSMENT OF PARTY COMMUNICATION	.01	.14	-.14	-.19	-.21	.21	-.07	.09	-.12	.15	-.11	.01	-.11	.14
PARTY LOYALTY AS A WORKER	-.20	-.03	b	b	b	-.08	-.14	-.29	b	b	b	-.05	b	-.20
PARTY LOYALTY AS A VOTER	(.35)	-.25	(.48)	b	b	(.42)	(.30)	(.41)	(.42)	-.28	-.12	(.54)	-.19	(.47)
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT WORK	.04	.20	-.16	.13	.08	-.10	.11	-.03	.04	.13	.09	-.03	.10	-.06
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT HOME	-.21	-.05	(.46)	-.14	b	b	(.36)	-.02	-.22	-.13	(.44)	-.05	-.19	-.17
PROCLIVITY TO JOIN GROUPS	.10	.04	.15	.25	.07	-.27	(.35)	-.06	.03	-.07	.00	.07	.25	-.03
POLITICAL HERITAGE	-.06	.19	-.27	(.32)	(.30)	-.03	-.16	.03	-.23	.01	-.10	-.01	-.28	.26
N=	(80)	(40)	(40)	(30)	(20)	(30)	(41)	(39)	(33)	(47)	(32)	(48)	(37)	(43)

^aThese are eta relationships rather than gammas.

^bThe N in some columns or rows is too small to permit reliable interpretation.

the twenty party experience variables in the left hand column. It also shows the same relationships when controlled for six major party experience variables. It was found in working with various cross controls for these data that these were the most powerful variables in "washing out" or "sustaining" associations between measures. If an association holds consistently, even when controlled for these six variables, it will generally hold no matter what other variables one might control for. Effects of controls for SES variables are noted when necessary in the text and in chapter five.

On all of the tables presented in this study the associations of .30 or more are circled. A party experience variable will be thought to be "meaningfully" related to one of the attitudinal measures only when the gamma or eta associations are: 1) Consistent in sign; 2) at or above .30 in absolute value when controlled for at least five of the six important variables; 3) at or near .30 in absolute value without controls and when controlled for all six important variables. As in the selection of .30 as a cutting point for meaningful relationships, this is an arbitrary designation. It is necessary to determine which party experience variables are most strongly associated with belief system variables and to assure that results are not trivial or spurious.

Table 2.4 shows that issue consciousness is meaningfully related to two party experience variables.

Ambition: This measure is strongly and very consistently related to issue consciousness. Those who say that there are distinctions between the party in government and the party organization are partially correct. Those who want to be in the party in government are more

articulate and issue conscious than those who want to remain in the party organization. However, actually holding such a position does not make an individual any more or less issue conscious.

Party loyalty as a voter: Those who deserted their party's candidates in any one of several recent elections are more likely to be articulate and issue conscious. The fact that so few activists deserted their party makes this relationship less relevant. Many issue conscious individuals reported voting straight tickets, but almost all the deserters were among the most issue conscious individuals in the sample. Of the forty-one respondents who were the most issue conscious, eleven deserted their party's ticket (more than twenty-five percent). Of the other thirty-nine respondents, who were less issue conscious, only three deserted their party (about eight percent). Nevertheless, three times as many highly issue conscious respondents remained loyal as deserted.

Party Experience and Partisanship

The relationship of party experience variables to partisanship are summarized on Table 2.5. There are three party experience variables which are associated with partisanship.

Self described role: The relationship between partisanship and this variable is strong, consistent, and positive. Those who gave an ideological or other directed reason for political participation are more partisan. Those who gave personal reasons are less likely to have consistently taken the position of their party on major political issues. This hardly seems revealing since it comes down to saying that those who are involved for ideological reasons are ideologues.

TABLE 2.5

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PARTISANSHIP AND PARTY EXPERIENCE
CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

	ENTIRE SAMPLE	PARTY		POSITION IN STRATARCHY			NUMBER OF CAMPA- IGNS WORKED		AMBITION		SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS		HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	
		DEMCS	REPUES	NOVICE	COMMITTEE	CANDID- ATES	FEW	MANY	LITTLE	ALOT	LITTLE	ALOT	FEW	MANY
PARTY	-.01			-.05	(-.34)	.25	.05	.05	(-.39)	.23	-.02	-.04	-.20	.17
POSITION	.27 ^a	(.32 ^a)	.14 ^a				.17 ^a	.22 ^a	.27 ^a	.29 ^a	.25 ^a	.20 ^a	.09 ^a	.12 ^a
PARTY BALANCE IN PRECINCT	.04	.12	-.02	-.19	.05	.23	-.09	.20	-.14	.18	-.08	.10	-.12	.21
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED	-.24	-.24	-.25	b	-.15	(.42)			-.09	(-.32)	.08	(.36)	.08	(.40)
KIND OF PARTY EXPERIENCE	-.23	-.24	-.23	.18	-.26	(-.39)	.05	-.22	-.05	(-.32)	-.06	-.27	-.02	-.28
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE	(.30)	(.30)	(.30)	.14	(.56)	(.74)	.13	(.52)	(.48)	.20	.19	(.45)	(.42)	(.36)
COMPETITION FACED WITHIN PARTY	.02	-.03	.01	-.02	-.06	.02	.08	-.12	.12	-.04	.08	-.02	-.03	.03
COMMITMENT TO PRESENT POSITION	.09	.04	.13	.26	.12	-.05	.08	.12	.08	.13	.04	.24	.18	.08
AMBITION	.00	-.07	.10	.14	-.04	.25	.15	-.07			-.01	.09	.12	.05
SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS	-.06	-.03	-.06	-.03	.22	.01	.01	-.02	.04	-.13			.15	.02
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	-.17	-.24	-.10	-.03	-.06	-.25	-.02	-.24	.04	(-.36)	.02	-.23		
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT ON POLITICS	-.13	-.11	-.16	.22	.04	-.20	.00	-.06	.13	-.27	.05	-.15	.21	-.14
SELF ESTIMATE OF FUTURE ACTIVITY	.05	-.07	.20	(.31)	-.19	-.05	.03	-.04	.01	.12	.18	.00	.20	-.08
ASSESSMENT OF PARTY COMMUNICATION	-.01	.09	-.13	-.09	.05	-.04	-.09	.11	.02	-.02	-.04	.02	.00	.00
PARTY LOYALTY AS A WORKER	(.35)	.29	(.73)	b	b	.29	.03	(.60)	b	.25	b	(.33)	b	(.37)
PARTY LOYALTY AS A VOTER	(.40)	(.35)	(.43)	b	b	.29	(.43)	(.37)	.25	(.46)	(.52)	(.35)	(.58)	.21
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT WORK	-.12	.02	-.27	-.21	.28	-.24	(-.34)	.10	.02	-.20	-.09	-.16	-.12	-.06
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT HOME	-.09	.15	(-.45)	(-.38)	b	b	-.28	(.42)	.06	-.19	-.04	-.08	-.14	.26
PROCLIVITY TO JOIN GROUPS	-.18	-.21	-.12	.12	(-.32)	-.22	.20	(.42)	-.16	-.21	.07	-.25	.06	(-.30)
POLITICAL HERITAGE	-.17	-.03	-.29	-.05	(.44)	-.18	-.25	-.03	-.16	-.15	-.14	-.21	-.10	(-.33)
N=	(80)	(40)	(40)	(30)	(20)	(30)	(41)	(39)	(33)	(47)	(32)	(48)	(37)	(43)

^aThese are eta relationships rather than gammas.

^bThe N in some columns or rows is too small to permit reliable interpretation.

Two measures of party loyalty: Both of the measures of party loyalty are strongly and consistently related positively to partisanship. Those who take their party's position on important issues are more likely to remain loyal to their party in terms of voting the straight ticket and continuing to work for "radical" candidates. Again, a caveat must be issued. Only a dozen or so individuals deserted their party. Almost all of those who deserted were non-partisan types in terms of their ideology. Yet there were many non-ideologues who stayed with their party even during hard times. Their attitude can be summed up in a quote attributed to Franklin D. Roosevelt: "They may be sons-of-bitches, but they are our sons-of-bitches."

Summary

Issue consciousness and partisanship are not related to the position in the stratarchy occupied by the individual. Nor are they closely related to the length of service or the intensity of participation. Issue consciousness is clearly related to ambition, and partisanship is related to self described role. Those who gave "other directed" reasons for involvement are more partisan. Both measures of ideology are related to party loyalty. Issue consciousness is related to voter loyalty, and partisanship is associated with both worker and voter loyalty. Those who desert their party are more likely to be issue conscious and less likely to be partisan.

CHAPTER 3

PARTY EXPECTATIONS AND PARTY EXPERIENCE

This chapter is concerned with the measures of expectations about the role of the parties, their relationship to ideology, and to party experience. The first section below discusses the inadequacy of professionalism as a measure of party expectations in Tucson. The second section discusses the relationship of attitudes toward the party to ideology, and the next three sections examine the relationship of these attitude measures to party experience. A summary concludes the chapter.

Measuring Professionalism

The agree/disagree (Likert) questions included in this study were subjected to a factor analysis. For this purpose an oblique rotation factor analysis was run using the Special Program for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 2.3 developed in March of 1972 by the Vogelback Computing Center at Northwestern University. This program revealed several important points about these questionnaire items. First, the inter-item correlations are uniformly low. Second, the patterns of professionalism factors found by Soule and Clarke (1970) cannot be discerned in the data. Third, the distinctions between dogmatism, machiavellianism, and at least three professionalism measures can be found. In short, the attempt to directly replicate the results of

Soule and Clarke's study of convention delegates demonstrates that the same factors they found are not present in the Tucson data.

However, the factors discovered by Soule and Clarke have certain face validity. They approximate the major aspects of professionalism as it was first outlined by James Q. Wilson (1962) and later used by Polsby and Wildavsky (1966) among others. There is no distinction between "willingness to compromise" and "preoccupation with winning," since the items that make up the former are also concerned with "winning." Soule and Clarke differentiated them on the basis of their factor analysis, but no such distinction can be made here. The factor analysis of the Tucson data indicate that questionnaire item sixty-six (preoccupation with winning) has a moderately high factor loading with two of the items that help make up the willingness to compromise scale. Thus professionalism can be seen as having three dimensions or parts: "desire for programmatic parties," "willingness to compromise to win," and "desire for intraparty democracy."

These three dimensions are not consistently related. Desire for intraparty democracy is not related to desire for programmatic parties ($G = .19$) or willingness to compromise to win ($G = .07$.) Yet desire for intraparty democracy was found to be an element in professionalism by both Soule and Clarke (1970) and by Hofstetter (1971). Programmatic parties and compromise are related to each other ($G = .50$), but this relationship is not consistent. Some party experience variables are positively related to desire for programmatic parties and negatively related to willingness to compromise to win. A single trait called "professionalism" does not exist in the belief system of Tucson

party activists. Attitudes toward the proper role and method of operation of political parties are much too complex to be described by a single attitude scale. These questionnaire items seem to measure three quite distinct and not consistently related sets of expectations about parties.

These measures of party expectations are skewed toward the lower end of the scales. Almost sixty-four percent of the total sample had the lowest possible score ("1") on the measure of desire for programmatic parties. Only about nine percent had the highest possible score ("3".) This means that the overwhelming majority of Tucson partisans think that political parties should be instruments for the presentation of policy to the electorate. Parties should be ideological organizations according to these respondents. As one individual put it: "The party should stand for something."

On the willingness to compromise to win variable no respondent scored "5", the highest possible score, and only one had the score of "4". Over fifty-two percent of the sample had scores of "1". Most of the activists showed little desire to compromise greatly in order to win elections. Some compromise seemed to be acceptable to most respondents, but they drew the line on bending their ideological commitments in order to gain votes. The attitude of most of the respondents seems to be that the public should choose between the parties on the basis of the ideology of the parties, but the parties should not try to choose their ideology on the basis of public opinion.

In measuring the desire for intraparty democracy, it was found that only five percent of the sample had scores of "3" and fifty-five

percent had scores of "1". Most respondents indicated that their party should be more democratic in its procedures and more open to new ideas and people. They believe the parties should not be dictatorially run.

Party Expectations and Ideology

Table 3.1 shows the gamma relationships between the three indicators of party expectations and ideology. There is no meaningful relationship between ideology and any of these measures of attitudes toward the role of political parties. Wilson (1962) and Soule and Clarke (1970) indicate that there is no relationship between ideology and professionalism. Other commentators (see Polsby and Wildavsky 1966, pp. 169-183, 193, and 236 for examples) have tied the two closely together. Many who have commented upon both the nomination of Barry Goldwater by the Republicans in 1964 and the nomination of George McGovern by the Democrats in 1972 have argued that amateurism, issue consciousness, and great partisanship go hand in hand. Table 3.1 shows that neither issue consciousness nor partisanship is related to these three measures of attitudes toward parties in Tucson, Arizona.

Desire for Programmatic Parties and Party Experience

The summary relationships between party experience variables and desire for programmatic parties is given on Table 3.2. This measure of party expectation is related to four party experience variables.

Position in the stratarchy: Committeemen and successful candidates are more likely to deny that the parties should be more policy oriented, while novices are the most likely to desire more programmatic parties.

TABLE 3.1

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PARTY EXPECTATION AND IDEOLOGY VARIABLES

	ISSUE CONSCIOUSNESS	PARTISANSHIP
DESIRE FOR PROGRAMMATIC PARTIES	-.09	-.21
WILLINGNESS TO COMPROMISE TO WIN	-.06	-.19
DESIRE FOR INTRAPARTY DEMOCRACY	-.17	-.08

TABLE 3.2

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DESIRE FOR PROGRAMMATIC PARTIES AND
PARTY EXPERIENCE CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

	ENTIRE SAMPLE	PARTY		POSITION IN STRATARCHY			NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED		AMBITION		SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS		HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	
		DEMOS	REPUS	NOVICE	COMMITTEE	CANDID- ATES	FEW	MANY	LITTLE	ALOT	LITTLE	ALOT	FEW	MANY
PARTY	.03			.04	-.16	.12	-.10	.10	.33	-.12	.17	-.02	.38	-.14
POSITION	.29 ^a	.35 ^a	.38 ^a				.36 ^a	.29 ^a	.27 ^a	.42 ^a	.57 ^a	.26 ^a	.30 ^a	.22 ^a
PARTY BALANCE IN PRECINCT	-.01	-.29	.23	.01	.58	.10	-.14	.09	-.05	.04	.31	-.21	.26	-.15
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED	.16	.22	.15	.16	-.27	-.01			.14	.16	.36	-.03	.30	-.09
KIND OF PARTY EXPERIENCE	.12	.12	.13	-.19	.04	.03	.30	.19	.10	.12	.61	-.16	.35	-.14
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE	.12	-.06	.30	.82	-.50	-.08	.63	.33	.08	.10	.45	-.17	.34	-.16
COMPETITION FACED WITHIN PARTY	.14	.32	.08	.04	.00	.34	.35	.14	.62	.14	.45	.00	.26	.35
COMMITMENT TO PRESENT POSITION	.04	.28	-.16	.45	.31	-.12	-.04	.09	.11	-.12	-.22	.18	.68	.39
AMBITION	.13	.37	-.12	-.27	.35	-.11	.01	.23			-.01	.01	.22	-.04
SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS	.12	.19	.07	.31	.30	.41	.20	-.09	.11	.11			.32	.41
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	.36	.59	.14	.53	.23	-.03	.45	.14	.49	.25	.63	.20		
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT ON POLITICS	.32	.48	.18	.67	.33	-.06	.44	.18	.44	.24	.77	.09	.65	-.04
SELF ESTIMATE OF FUTURE ACTIVITY	.25	.34	.17	.14	.68	.12	.04	.53	.39	-.02	.08	.36	.35	.14
ASSESSMENT OF PARTY COMMUNICATION	.05	.18	-.08	.09	.01	-.12	.29	-.24	.09	.04	.31	.20	.22	-.06
PARTY LOYALTY AS A WORKER	-.11	.32	b	b	b	-.08	.57	.41	b	-.21	b	.08	b	.00
PARTY LOYALTY AS A VOTER	-.18	.43	.07	b	b	.22	.54	.24	.20	-.29	-.12	-.25	.54	.12
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT WORK	-.14	-.01	-.26	.36	-.02	-.17	-.11	-.18	-.13	-.13	-.24	-.07	.66	-.24
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT HOME	.05	.07	.01	.46	b	b	.21	-.27	-.14	.16	-.15	.23	.33	.48
PROCLIVITY TO JOIN GROUPS	.10	.05	.17	-.04	-.05	-.13	.07	-.05	.03	.06	.29	-.06	.35	-.22
POLITICAL HERITAGE	.15	.22	.07	.00	.24	.08	.01	.21	.24	.08	.50	-.05	-.03	.30
N=	(80)	(40)	(40)	(30)	(20)	(30)	(41)	(39)	(33)	(47)	(32)	(48)	(37)	(43)

^aThese are eta relationships rather than gammas.

^bThe N in some columns or rows is too small to permit reliable interpretation.

Hours per week spent campaigning: This variable is positively related to desire for programmatic parties, which means that those who work the hardest are the least likely to desire more programmatic parties. Those who spend little time on politics are more likely to desire more policy orientation.

Hours per week spent on politics: Confirmation of the above statements are found in the relationship between hours per week spent on politics and programmatic parties. Again, those who work the hardest have the least desire for more programmatic parties. Those who normally spent little or no time on politics are the most likely to want more program orientation.

Self estimate of future activity: The respondents who plan to maintain or increase their participation in politics are a little more likely to reject the notion that parties should be more programmatic. Again, it is found that the least committed are the most in favor of programmatic parties.

Willingness to Compromise to Win and Party Experience

Summary Table 3.3 shows the associations between willingness to compromise to win and the twenty party experience variables. This table supports the hypothesis that compromise is related to six party experience variables.

Position in the strataarchy: Novices are a little less likely to favor compromise. Committeemen are the greatest compromisers according to this measure. Candidates are neither as willing to compromise as

TABLE 3.3

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN WILLINGNESS TO COMPROMISE TO WIN AND PARTY EXPERIENCE CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

	ENTIRE SAMPLE	PARTY		POSITION IN STRATARCHY			NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED		AMBITION		SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS		HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	
		DEMOS	REPUBS	NOVICE	COMMITTEE	CANDIDATES	FEW	MANY	LITTLE	ALCT	LITTLE	ALCT	FEW	MANY
PARTY	.14			.56	-.12	-.04	.15	.08	.63	-.17	.17	.06	.55	-.27
POSITION	.24 ^a	.40 ^a	.23 ^a				.36 ^a	.20 ^a	.19 ^a	.53 ^a	.54 ^a	.19 ^a	.37 ^a	.18 ^a
PARTY BALANCE IN PRECINCT	.08	-.18	.27	-.01	-.35	.33	.05	.09	.09	.10	.30	-.05	.21	.05
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED	.31	.38	.24	.44	.00	.32			.20	.38	.35	.35	.47	.19
KIND OF PARTY EXPERIENCE	.17	.16	.17	.06	.02	.21	.04	-.06	-.06	.27	.33	.17	.47	-.06
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE	-.06	-.04	-.06	-.28	.06	-.07	.06	-.18	-.29	.05	-.10	.00	.47	.35
COMPETITION FACED WITHIN PARTY	-.16	-.25	.00	-.48	.04	-.06	-.39	.13	-.58	.11	-.27	-.06	-.08	-.24
COMMITMENT TO PRESENT POSITION	.03	.12	-.06	.10	-.16	.01	-.16	.18	.00	.02	.22	-.04	.36	-.2E
AMBITION	.11	.43	-.19	-.10	.53	-.12	-.12	.26			.28	.10	.18	.07
SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS	-.10	-.01	-.16	-.02	.55	-.25	.28	-.15	-.21	-.06			.07	.40
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	.07	.39	-.20	-.20	-.11	-.10	-.08	-.14	-.03	.10	.27	.06		
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT ON POLITICS	.06	.28	-.12	-.11	-.10	.02	-.20	-.05	-.19	.16	.36	.06	.19	-.0E
SELF ESTIMATE OF FUTURE ACTIVITY	.12	.58	-.26	-.18	.38	.28	-.11	.42	-.21	.26	-.05	.38	.04	.22
ASSESSMENT OF PARTY COMMUNICATION	.10	.05	.14	.17	.38	.21	.21	-.10	-.35	.32	-.28	.31	.16	.04
PARTY LOYALTY AS A WORKER	.15	.08	b	b	b	.11	-.16	.47	b	.04	b	.20	b	.10
PARTY LOYALTY AS A VOTER	-.26	-.31	-.18	b	b	-.23	-.34	-.12	-.42	-.18	-.55	-.00	-.69	-.20
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT WORK	-.17	-.07	-.22	-.29	.44	-.05	-.03	.33	-.16	-.17	-.24	-.11	.40	.10
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT HOME	.40	.18	.70	.40	b	b	.69	-.04	.62	.27	.46	.31	.32	.55
PROCLIVITY TO JOIN GROUPS	.26	.37	.13	-.03	.41	.33	-.08	.38	.06	.36	.40	.28	.26	.25
POLITICAL HERITAGE	.36	.62	.12	.70	.42	.00	.66	.07	.41	.29	.60	.35	.42	.26
N=	(80)	(40)	(40)	(30)	(20)	(30)	(41)	(39)	(33)	(47)	(32)	(46)	(37)	(43)

^aThese are eta relationships rather than gammas.^bThe N in some columns or rows is too small to permit reliable interpretation.

those in the party central committees nor are they as inflexible and uncompromising as the novices. These differences are slight.

Number of campaigns worked: Those who have worked in the party a long time are more willing to compromise, while those who are newcomers to party work are less willing to compromise. This relationship holds even when controls for age are introduced. Among those over forty years old the gamma relationship is .38. Among those under forty the gamma is .31.

Party loyalty as a voter: Voting loyalty is negatively related to compromise, although this relationship is strongest primarily among the Democrats. Those who split their tickets when they voted in any one of several recent elections are more likely to be willing to compromise to win. Those who believe that the party should compromise to win elections are more likely to be the ones who compromised themselves by voting for the opposition party. On the other hand, the "compromisers" are not more likely to desert the party when it nominates a "radical" candidate. This seemingly contradictory set of relationships can be accounted for by the difference between private and public loyalty. As one respondent said: "As an official of my party, I owe them my public allegiance, but what I do in private is my own business." The "compromisers" could support the party publicly, and vote against "radical" candidates in the polling booth.

Political support at home: Those who have support for their political beliefs in their own families are more willing to compromise to win. Others, who reported that some of their family members belonged to the opposition party, were not willing to compromise for victory.

Evidently, compromise is difficult to explain to family members who do not share direct party ties. Since members of the opposition are unlikely to share the conviction that compromise is good because it aids the party, the justification for such action is undermined.

Proclivity to join groups: Table 3.3 indicates that those who have wide group experience outside the party are slightly more willing to compromise to win. Activists who are not willing to compromise are less experienced in group activity. Three explanations for this relationship are possible. Perhaps those who find it easy to compromise also find group contacts more rewarding, or secondary group contact may teach individuals to be more willing to compromise to achieve group goals. Perhaps a third variable causes both willingness to compromise and greater group participation.

Political heritage: The association reveals that, consistent with the earlier hypothesis, those with deep familial roots in the party find it easier to compromise. Those who are only first generation partisans are more likely to be inflexible.

Desire for Intraparty Democracy and Party Experience

Information on the professionalism variable desire for intraparty democracy and its association with party experience is presented in Table 3.4. Close observation reveals that this measure is related meaningfully to five party experience variables.

Party: Many Republicans take the position that no more intraparty democracy is needed. The overwhelming majority of Democrats take the opposite position that the councils of the party should be more open

TABLE 3.4

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DESIRE FOR INTRAPARTY DEMOCRACY AND
PARTY EXPERIENCE CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

	ENTIRE SAMPLE	PARTY		POSITION IN STRATARCHY			NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED		AMBITION		SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS		HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	
		DEMOS	REFUGS	NOVICE	COMMITTEE	CANDIDATES	FEW	MANY	LITTLE	ALOT	LITTLE	ALOT	FEW	MANY
PARTY	.42			.77	.38	.25	.64	.16	.64	.25	.35	.42	.61	.30
POSITION	.30 ^a	.39 ^a	.29 ^a				.55 ^a	.32 ^a	.43 ^a	.22 ^a	.31 ^a	.34 ^a	.13 ^a	.43 ^a
PARTY BALANCE IN PRECINCT	.06	-.16	.02	-.09	-.16	.05	.29	-.15	.16	-.02	.00	.11	.10	.00
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED	.21	.40	-.06	.78	b	.02			.32	.14	.62	-.03	.49	.00
KIND OF PARTY EXPERIENCE	.11	.05	.04	.65	-.40	.01	.46	-.44	.32	.04	.39	-.03	.44	-.11
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE	-.12	-.12	-.02	-.14	-.04	-.01	-.17	-.09	-.36	.12	-.12	-.13	.19	-.45
COMPETITION FACED WITHIN PARTY	.08	.00	.65	.71	.74	.43	.00	.23	-.18	.27	-.24	.22	.30	.47
COMMITMENT TO PRESENT POSITION	.36	.73	.14	.52	-.06	.36	.50	.23	.60	.18	.79	-.06	.62	.13
AMBITION	-.01	.20	-.20	.14	-.07	-.32	.19	-.30			.25	-.24	.25	-.31
SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS	.06	-.06	.18	.08	.09	-.04	.29	-.34	.37	-.16			.02	-.01
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	.16	.44	-.02	-.08	.37	.19	.20	-.04	.39	.04	.22	.25		
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT ON POLITICS	.11	.38	-.09	-.05	.51	-.25	.25	-.24	.47	-.09	.17	.08	.02	.00
SELF ESTIMATE OF FUTURE ACTIVITY	.10	.52	-.03	.17	.31	.19	.17	.15	.39	.14	.21	.00	.24	-.06
ASSESSMENT OF PARTY COMMUNICATION	.34	.31	.37	.26	.34	.23	.66	.02	.61	.15	.16	.42	.10	.51
PARTY LOYALTY AS A WORKER	.57	.72	b	b	b	.76	b	.60	b	.81	b	.64	b	.74
PARTY LOYALTY AS A VOTER	.02	-.43	.49	b	b	.24	-.16	.16	.03	.00	-.52	.51	-.19	.17
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT WORK	.09	.13	.28	-.29	.71	-.09	-.04	.20	.41	-.14	-.05	.20	-.22	.35
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT HOME	.12	.48	-.41	-.05	b	b	.33	-.27	.24	.03	.26	-.04	-.19	.54
PROCLIVITY TO JOIN GROUPS	.02	.30	-.26	.35	-.49	.18	-.10	-.04	-.03	.13	.32	-.15	.13	-.03
POLITICAL HERITAGE	.05	.31	-.19	.52	-.14	-.46	.11	-.08	.34	-.14	.20	-.07	.36	-.25
N ^a	(80)	(40)	(40)	(30)	(20)	(30)	(41)	(39)	(33)	(47)	(32)	(48)	(37)	(43)

^aThese are eta relationships rather than gammas.

^bThe N in some columns or rows is too small to permit reliable interpretation.

and democratic. This may be largely a reflection of the turmoil during the 1972 campaign over the new "McGovern Rules" for convention delegate selection. The Democrats found themselves in the position of having to defend the new rules and the ideals behind them. The Republicans became the critics of the rules. Or it could be a reflection of greater party harmony within the Republican ranks in Arizona. This greater harmony may be largely the result of the harmonious campaign the Republicans conducted in 1972 and the fact that their party was victorious. The Democrats had much intraparty bickering in 1972, and in some instances the bickering deteriorated into a full scale donnybrook after the election results were final. The Democrats may have perceived a greater need for democracy within their party councils. Or they may have seen these questionnaire items as tests of their support for the "freer" McGovern Rules. Yet the party differences here are a matter of degree. Even a majority of the Republicans agreed that some measure of greater democracy in party councils would be a good thing.

Position in the stratarchy: Novices and successful candidates are the most likely to say that greater intraparty democracy is needed. Unsuccessful candidates are slightly more likely to reject the notion of increased democracy in party councils, while committeemen are relatively opposed to greater democracy. This similarity of views between committeemen and unsuccessful candidates is consistent with their common view that party communication links are "good."

Commitment to present position: Many of those who wish to maintain or increase their party activity take the position that more democracy is not needed. Those who are dropping out of politics claim that

democracy is indeed necessary in party councils. Perhaps such a belief directly accounts for their lack of further career goals. Those who are content with present procedures may find it easier to continue political activity.

Assessment of party communication: As suggested above, there seems to be a connection between assessment of party communication and desire for more democracy within the party. Activists who believe that party communication is effective also believe that more democracy is not needed. The respondents who indicated that the communication channels are blocked are usually the ones who want more within-party democracy. This is almost tautological, as a careful examination and comparison of the questionnaire items shows. Both sets of questions measure discontent with party procedures more than anything else.

Party loyalty as a worker: Once again, it is demonstrated that discontent with the party organization is the major factor underlying desire for intraparty democracy. Almost all of those who deserted their party when it nominated a "radical" candidate reported that they want more intraparty democracy. Those who stayed loyal to the party are more evenly divided between those who desire more intraparty democracy and those who do not. It may have been the case that those who backed Barry Goldwater and George McGovern were discontented with their party's traditional way of doing things, but it is also true that most of those who deserted these candidates were equally discontent with the party. Those of long service who liked the party procedures stayed with Goldwater or McGovern even if they disagreed with their ideology.

Summary

There is no single, unidimensional attitudinal trait of "professionalism" within the belief systems of party activists in Tucson, Arizona. However, in measuring three sets of attitudes or expectations about the role and functioning of parties, several conclusions emerge.

The three measures of attitudes toward the role of political parties that are examined here are associated with different aspects of party experience. Desire for programmatic parties is closely related to intensity of present participation in party affairs, while willingness to compromise to win is more closely related to the length of time a person has been involved and the extent of his familial roots in the party. Desire for intraparty democracy seems to be related to the individual's satisfaction with the party, and his desire to remain in politics. The three party expectation variables are only weakly related to position in the strataarchy.

Two of these measures of attitude toward the role of the parties are strongly related to party loyalty. Those who are willing to compromise to win are more likely to vote for the opposition party, and those who believe that there should be more intraparty democracy are more likely to desert the party when it nominates "radical" candidates.

There is a close relationship between party experience variables and the three measures of party expectations. Such attitudes toward the party shape, or are shaped by, the kinds of party experience the individual has.

CHAPTER 4

MACHIAVELLIANISM, DOGMATISM, AND PARTY EXPERIENCE

This chapter is an examination of the variables machiavellianism and dogmatism. The first section details the measures of these traits and the results of their application to this sample of party activists. The second section shows the association between these two psychological variables and the other belief system measures. Then follow two sections which deal with the relationship between these variables and party experience. The last section is, again, a summary.

Measuring Machiavellianism and Dogmatism

Machiavellianism

The oblique rotation factor analysis referred to above (page 55) reveals that machiavellianism is a unidimensional trait. Most of the items that make up the Mach IV scale shared a common factor loading. None of the separate dimensions of machiavellianism as designed by Christie and Geis (1970) proved to be distinct factors. This commonality is reflected in the high interrelationships between these separate dimensions. Negativism, duplicity, and distrust of people share gamma associations between .28 and .80. Machiavellianism, therefore, can be considered as a single unidimensional trait summarizing the individual dimensions that Christie and Geis have found within it. It will be so treated here.

The party activists considered in this study are uniformly low in this trait. On the Mach IV scale, which extends from one to seventeen, no respondent interviewed scored higher than fourteen. Only twenty percent of the respondents scored above seven. The scores are uniformly distributed between one and seven. For this analysis the scores were arbitrarily grouped into octals or eight levels of about ten respondents each. One finding is already clear. Party activists in Tucson either do not share the attitudes of Machiavelli, or they are too machiavellian to admit it.

Dogmatism

Dogmatism was designed to be a unidimensional trait. The factor analysis of the Likert scale questions demonstrated that this is indeed the case. Most of the Short Dogmatism Scale items shared relatively high factor loadings. No distinct factors within dogmatism were discovered. Dogmatism is treated as a single unidimensional trait in this study.

The party activists in Tucson are not very dogmatic. While dogmatism scores could range from one to ten, no respondent scored above eight and only ten percent of the respondents scored above five. For the analysis utilized here the scores above five were combined into one category to avoid zero cells which could affect gamma and eta computations. The raw scores were utilized for those who scored between one and five.

Similarity of item wording could lead one to conclude that both the dogmatism and machiavellianism scales were measuring the same

attitudes. However, they are not related ($G = .21$). They are two quite distinct and separate attitudinal measures.

Machiavellianism, Dogmatism, and Other Belief System Variables

Table 4.1 summarizes the associations between machiavellianism and dogmatism on the one hand, and professionalism and ideological variables on the other. There is only one meaningful relationship between these two sets of variables. Machiavellianism is strongly related to desire for programmatic parties. The association is positive indicating that those who share more of the attitudes of Machiavelli do not want the parties to be clear, definite, and uncompromising on issues. Those who want the parties to stand forthrightly or fall on certain issues are less machiavellian. This relationship has some logical basis, but logic would dictate that all of the party expectation variables would be associated with machiavellianism. The image of the machiavellian politician would certainly seem to include great willingness to compromise and little respect for greater democratic participation within the party, however the other two party expectation variables are not related meaningfully to the Mach IV scale.

Machiavellianism and Party Experience

Machiavellianism is not meaningfully related to any of the twenty party experience variables (Table 4.2). The relationships are low and inconsistent. No relationship comes close to meeting the standards of meaningfulness.

The consistently low scores on the Mach IV scale cannot account for the lack of relationship found in Table 4.2, because there are

TABLE 4.1

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS OF MACHIAVELLIANISM AND DOGMATISM TO PARTY EXPECTATION AND IDEOLOGICAL VARIABLES

	PARTY EXPECTATION VARIABLES			IDEOLOGICAL VARIABLES	
	DESIRE FOR PROGRAMMATIC PARTIES	WILLINGNESS TO COMPROMISE	DESIRE FOR INTRAPARTY DEMOCRACY	ISSUE CONSCIOUSNESS	PARTISANSHIP
MACHIAVELLIANISM	.57	.24	.00	.24	-.07
DOGMATISM	.21	-.12	.10	-.13	.06

TABLE 4.2

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MACHIAVELLIANISM AND PARTY EXPERIENCE
CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

	ENTIRE SAMPLE	PARTY DEMOS REPUBS		POSITION IN STRATARCHY NOVICE COMMITTEE CANDID-ATES			NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED FEW MANY		AMBITION LITTLE ALOT		SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS LITTLE ALOT		HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING FEW MANY	
PARTY	-.20			-.21	(-.46)	.00	.27	.03	(-.40)	-.08	-.21	-.13	-.15	-.27
POSITION	(.33) ^a	.25 ^a	.10 ^a				.19 ^a	.14 ^a	.16 ^a	.27 ^a	.17 ^a	(.31) ^a	.21 ^a	.11 ^a
PARTY BALANCE IN PRECINCT	-.13	-.02	-.19	-.04	(-.46)	-.13	-.25	-.01	-.23	-.09	-.02	-.18	-.14	-.16
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED	-.08	-.07	-.02	-.02	-.14	.00			-.08	-.10	-.01	-.17	.02	-.13
KIND OF PARTY EXPERIENCE	-.02	.01	-.01	.08	-.24	.13	-.07	.23	-.08	-.01	.21	-.16	.13	-.10
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE	-.05	-.20	.01	.23	-.03	-.29	.23	(.36)	.15	-.22	.22	-.28	-.03	-.02
COMPETITION FACED WITHIN PARTY	.07	.03	-.06	.17	.23	-.15	-.09	.22	-.02	.14	.21	-.06	.24	-.12
COMMITMENT TO PRESENT POSITION	.14	.21	.05	(.35)	.10	.00	.22	.07	.05	.21	.13	.13	.24	.08
AMBITION	.05	-.02	.11	.06	(.53)	-.14	.06	.10			-.06	.01	.10	.02
SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS	.04	-.01	.08	.22	-.04	.10	.08	.14	-.02	.07			.17	-.05
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	.01	.03	-.06	.12	.03	.18	-.01	.13	.00	-.01	.00	-.08		
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT ON POLITICS	.00	-.02	-.03	(.42)	.09	-.10	.11	-.01	.10	-.09	(.42)	-.24	.25	-.06
SELF ESTIMATE OF FUTURE ACTIVITY	.22	.22	.18	.27	(.61)	.06	.27	.13	(.30)	.15	(.31)	.14	.24	.24
ASSESSMENT OF PARTY COMMUNICATION	.09	-.16	.00	-.18	.02	.00	-.05	-.05	-.11	-.08	-.18	-.08	-.13	-.05
PARTY LOYALTY AS A WORKER	.09	.23	b	b	b	-.15	.16	.02	b	.12	b	.13	b	-.03
PARTY LOYALTY AS A VOTER	-.23	.08	(-.53)	b	b	-.13	(-.40)	-.04	-.25	-.20	-.17	-.25	(-.41)	-.10
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT WORK	.01	(.34)	(-.30)	.07	-.22	.03	.06	-.03	-.08	.06	.03	-.01	-.10	.13
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT HOME	-.08	.19	(-.44)	-.09	b	b	-.06	-.03	-.16	-.02	(-.32)	.16	-.26	(.34)
PROCLIVITY TO JOIN GROUPS	-.05	-.12	-.01	.20	-.10	-.13	.11	-.05	-.11	-.08	-.03	-.11	.11	-.16
POLITICAL HERITAGE	-.06	-.17	-.20	-.22	.02	.08	-.09	.01	.01	-.09	.18	-.17	-.09	.01
N=	(80)	(40)	(40)	(30)	(20)	(30)	(41)	(39)	(33)	(47)	(32)	(48)	(37)	(43)

^aThese are eta relationships rather than gammas.

^bThe N in some columns or rows is too small to permit reliable interpretation.

differences in machiavellianism within this sample. The scale used in the study includes eight levels of machiavellianism. Each level had about ten respondents. This is certainly enough variation to utilize the gamma and eta measures employed here. The lack of relationship is clear. Party and political activity in Tucson, Arizona, is not related in any way to the possession, acquisition, or maintenance of the attitudes of Machiavelli.

Dogmatism and Party Experience

Dogmatism is more highly related to party experience than is machiavellianism. Table 4.3 shows that dogmatism is meaningfully related to three party experience variables.

Party: Democrats are more dogmatic than are Republicans in Tucson. Because this association holds only for novices, it may be a product of the differences between the Republican and Democratic convention selection processes. The Democrats were operating under the new, complex McGovern Rules. The Republicans were under "politics as usual." The Republican convention delegates were more or less hand picked to renominate President Nixon. Yet the Republican State Convention delegation from Tucson had almost as many newcomers to politics as did the Democratic delegation, which was reformed in order to allow novices a greater chance to participate. The differences in the two conventions in Phoenix could not have been greater. The Democrats had a near violent melee from which no candidate emerged as the clear winner. The Republicans had a family gathering during which they congratulated

TABLE 4.3

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DOGMATISM AND PARTY EXPERIENCE
CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

	ENTIRE SAMPLE	PARTY DEMOS REPUS		POSITION IN STRATARCHY NOVICE COMMITTEE CANDIDATES			NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED FEW MANY		AMBITION LITTLE ALOT		SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS LITTLE ALOT		HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING FEW MANY	
PARTY	(-.30)			(-.57)	-.22	-.12	-.29	-.25	(-.36)	(-.32)	(-.56)	-.16	(.60)	-.10
POSITION	.20 ^a	.23 ^a	.15 ^a				.08 ^a	.20 ^a	(.41)	.08 ^a	.14 ^a	.16 ^a	.15 ^a	.18 ^a
PARTY BALANCE IN PRECINCT	-.13	-.10	-.04	-.15	-.26	-.05	-.09	-.15	-.26	-.03	-.20	-.10	-.17	-.11
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED	-.14	-.09	-.08	-.10	(.42)	-.05			-.23	-.03	-.14	-.12	-.20	-.08
KIND OF PARTY EXPERIENCE	-.15	-.06	-.14	-.24	-.14	-.13	(-.30)	.11	-.20	-.09	-.26	-.11	-.24	-.03
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE	.27	-.15	(.59)	.27	(.46)	.13	.06	(.45)	(.67)	.04	(.41)	.20	(.50)	.15
COMPETITION FACED WITHIN PARTY	.25	(.32)	.06	(.54)	(.60)	-.19	.27	.14	(.40)	.15	(.69)	.03	(.46)	.10
COMMITMENT TO PRESENT POSITION	.15	.19	.12	.27	(.53)	-.08	.27	.05	.16	.25	.28	.09	.20	.15
AMBITION	-.19	-.17	-.21	(-.38)	(.35)	(-.54)	(-.41)	.04			-.26	-.24	-.27	-.11
SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS	.00	-.02	.00	-.02	.09	-.15	-.02	.06	-.09	.12			-.14	.17
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	-.03	-.06	.01	.03	.06	-.12	.01	-.02	-.06	.04	-.10	.02		
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT ON POLITICS	-.05	-.08	-.01	.11	.16	-.13	.02	-.04	-.15	.02	-.12	-.03	.06	.02
SELF ESTIMATE OF FUTURE ACTIVITY	.07	-.02	.08	.20	.27	-.21	.00	.02	(.40)	-.02	(.32)	-.08	.20	-.02
ASSESSMENT OF PARTY COMMUNICATION	-.07	-.22	.14	.02	.12	-.15	.02	-.12	.06	-.17	-.02	-.14	-.08	-.05
PARTY LOYALTY AS A WORKER	.04	.17	b	b	b	-.04	.23	-.12	b	-.03	b	-.10	b	-.06
PARTY LOYALTY AS A VOTER	-.05	.09	-.16	b	b	.04	-.23	.07	-.12	-.05	(.41)	.17	-.07	-.10
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT WORK	.22	.22	.15	(.51)	.15	.06	(.32)	.12	.13	.24	.05	(.33)	(.32)	.15
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT HOME	-.12	-.10	-.01	-.20	b	b	.09	(-.30)	(.47)	.06	(.34)	.06	(.30)	.25
PROCLIVITY TO JOIN GROUPS	-.13	-.19	-.06	-.09	(-.37)	.04	-.13	-.04	(.34)	.06	-.05	-.18	-.21	.00
POLITICAL HERITAGE	-.19	-.17	-.23	-.07	-.07	(-.33)	-.21	-.15	-.02	-.29	.04	(-.30)	.02	(.42)
N=	(80)	(40)	(40)	(30)	(20)	(30)	(41)	(39)	(33)	(47)	(32)	(48)	(37)	(43)

^aThese are eta relationships rather than gammas.

^bThe N in some columns or rows is too small to permit reliable interpretation.

each other on being lucky enough to agree on the renomination of an incumbent president.

Self described role: This relationship indicates that those who gave an "other directed" or ideological reason for their political involvement are more dogmatic than those who claimed personal motivation. This may be bad news for the future of party politics, since ideological reasons for political participation may be increasing as ideological politics itself increases (Nixon 1971).

Competition faced within party: Those who faced more competition within their own party tend to be more dogmatic. Most of those who achieved their current position in the party stratarchy without opposition are not as dogmatic. This relationship is probably spurious. Because the Republican novices were all hand picked and elected by acclamation, they all reported "no opposition" in their efforts to gain their offices. The Democratic convention selection process was a confused, chaotic system in which each voter had around fifteen votes which he could bestow on one or up to fifteen candidates as he desired. This election process was probably the most competitive in Arizona history. Thus, the Democratic novices reported unanimously that they had a great deal of opposition within their party. The differences in the dogmatism of Democratic and Republican novices could account for the differences observed here between those who did and did not have opposition within their own party. This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that this relationship does not hold for Republicans nor for those who report that politics is very important or that they work many hours on politics.

Summary

Dogmatism and machiavellianism are not related to the other belief system variables with one exception. Machiavellianism is related to desire for programmatic parties. The more machiavellian individuals are more opposed to programmatic parties.

Machiavellianism is not related to any party experience variables, while dogmatism is related only to party identification (among novices) and to self described role. Dogmatism and machiavellianism are not related to position in the stratarchy, nor to intensity of present participation, nor to the length of time the individual has been involved in politics. Party experience, party expectations, and ideology are largely unrelated to these two important psychological variables.

CHAPTER 5

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND PARTY EXPERIENCE

The relationships of party experience variables and belief system variables to socioeconomic status are the subject of this chapter. The first section examines the SES of the respondents. The section following that examines the association between socioeconomic status and the belief system variables (ideology, party expectations, machiavellianism, and dogmatism). The next to the last section deals with the relationship of party experience to SES, and especially to ethno/race. The last section summarizes this chapter.

Demographic Profile of the Sample

Table 5.1 illustrates the fact that the party activists in Tucson, Arizona, have high socioeconomic status. They are well educated, professionals or managers in occupation, well-to-do, mostly white, half Protestant, and largely male.

These seven SES variables are somewhat interrelated, as one would expect (Table 5.2.) Ethno/race is very highly related to all the other SES variables except age. Age is not related to any other SES variable, and religion is only related to ethno/race. Mexicans and blacks tend to have lower occupational status, income, and educational attainment. Ethno/race is such a strong predictor of these other SES variables that it can be treated as a summary variable which pulls most of the other measures together.

TABLE 5.1
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE

SEX:	MALE	75%	
	FEMALE	25	
ETHNO/RACE:	WHITE	85%	
	NON-WHITE	15	
AGE:	18-23	12%	
	24-26	12	
	27-35	18	
	36-39	11	
	40-42	12	
	43-48	11	
	49-62	14	
	63-81	9	
OCCUPATIONAL STATUS:			
	UNSKILLED WORK OR SERVICE OCCUPATIONS		6%
	SKILLED LABOR		5
	SALES AND CLERICAL WORK		9
	MANAGERS, OFFICIALS, AND PROPRIETORS		42
	PROFESSIONALS		38
INCOME:	UNDER \$8,000	9%	
	8,000-9,999	8	
	10,000-11,999	14	
	12,000-13,999	12	
	14,000-15,999	9	
	16,000-17,999	8	
	18,000-19,999	8	
	OVER \$20,000	34	
RELIGION:	PROTESTANT	51%	
	OTHERS	49	
EDUCATION:	HIGH SCHOOL OR LESS		15%
	HIGH SCHOOL PLUS NON COLLEGE TRAINING		6
	ATTENDED COLLEGE		32
	COLLEGE GRADUATE		14
	POST GRADUATE COLLEGE TRAINING		32

N = (80)

TABLE 5.2

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS AMONG SOCIOECONOMIC VARIABLES

	ETHNO/RACE	AGE	OCCUPATION	INCOME	RELIGION	EDUCATION
SEX	-.29	.17	(-.35)	-.10	.03	(-.42)
ETHNO/RACE		.21	(-.66)	(-.54)	(.58)	(-.61)
AGE			-.09	.15	-.29	-.19
OCCUPATION				.26	.01	(.65)
INCOME					-.11	.08
RELIGION						-.28

Socioeconomic Status and Belief System Variables

The associations between socioeconomic status variables and belief system variables are displayed in Table 5.3. Partisanship, willingness to compromise to win, and machiavellianism are totally unrelated to SES. Ethno/race is related to two of these variables. Non-whites are less issue conscious and more dogmatic than whites. Education is also related to two belief system variables. The better educated respondents are more issue conscious and more likely to take the position that their party needs greater democracy in its councils. Two belief system variables are associated with occupational status. Those with high status take the position that the parties do not need to be more program or policy oriented. These same high status individuals tend to take the position that the party should be more democratic.

Controlling for third variables causes some of these SES relationships to "wash out." The association of ethno/race to issue consciousness is a reflection of the lower educational level of the Mexicans and blacks. This means that ideology is not related to SES, except that those with higher educational attainment are more issue conscious. The relationship between ethno/race and dogmatism is primarily a reflection of the greater number of Mexicans among the group of Democratic novices. After controls for party are introduced, there is no relationship between SES and either machiavellianism or dogmatism.

Socioeconomic Status and Party Experience

Table 5.4 (page 84) shows the relationships between the seven SES variables and the twenty party experience variables. There are many meaningful associations between these two sets of variables.

TABLE 5.3

GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS OF SOCIOECONOMIC VARIABLES TO IDEOLOGICAL VARIABLES, PARTY EXPECTATION VARIABLES, DOGMATISM, AND MACHIAVELLIANISM

	IDEOLOGICAL VARIABLES		PARTY EXPECTATION VARIABLES			MACHIA- VELLIAN- ISM	DOG- MA- TISM
	ISSUE CONSCIOUS- NESS	PARTI- SAN- SHIP	DESIRE FOR PROGRAM PARTIES	WILLINGNESS TO COMPROMISE	DESIRE FOR INTRAPARTY DEMOCRACY		
SEX	-.18	.14	.03	-.14	.28	-.26	-.05
ETHNO/RACE	(-.33)	.05	-.07	-.15	-.21	-.04	(.31)
AGE	-.26	-.20	.08	.08	.13	-.01	.01
OCCUPATIONAL STATUS	.26	-.05	(.35)	.10	(-.30)	.29	.14
INCOME	.00	-.23	.19	.13	.04	-.01	-.03
RELIGION	.05	.13	.13	-.14	-.14	.07	.13
EDUCATION	(.42)	.11	-.09	.16	(-.32)	.07	-.17

Sex: Gender is related to five party experience variables.

Women are less likely to have a "high" position in the party. Most of the female respondents were novices in the Democratic party and Committeemen in the Republican. There was one female candidate in the Republican sample, and two in the Democratic. Women are also less committed to their political roles and far less ambitious than men. They are also less likely to belong to groups outside the party. The relationship of sex to "political support at work" is a result of coding procedures. For those who did not work outside the home, the "support at home" response was substituted for support at work. More family support is apparent for all respondents in this sample, and more women than men reported not working outside the home. Thus women appear to have a greater amount of political support "at work."

Age: Four party experience variables are associated with age. Novices are much younger than any other group, as would be expected of those just starting in politics. Successful candidates are the oldest group in the strataarchy, followed closely by committeemen. Unsuccessful candidates are almost as young as novices. Older persons have more years of party experience, but this gamma relationship is only a moderate .38. Different individuals in this sample evidently entered politics at very different times in their lives. Older people are more likely to have attained a "high" position in the party as is shown by the association between age and kind of party experience. Older people are also likely to have greater support at home. This may be a result of the fact that spouses are much more likely to agree with the activists' party affiliation than are parents. Older party workers and

TABLE 5.4
GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PARTY EXPERIENCE AND SOCIOECONOMIC VARIABLES

	SEX	ETHNO /RACE	AGE	OCCU- PATION STATUS	IN- COME	RELI- GION	EDUC- ATION
PARTY	.00	(-.73)	.03	-.12	.22	(-.72)	.18
POSITION	.29 ^a	.13 ^a	(.48 ^a)	.22 ^a	.21 ^a	.23 ^a	(.35 ^a)
BALANCE IN PRECINCT	-.05	-.13	.20	-.05	.26	(-.41)	.11
# OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED	-.28	-.10	(.38)	.03	.19	-.26	.14
KIND OF PARTY EXPERIENCE	(-.33)	-.04	(.40)	-.01	.10	(-.38)	.14
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE	-.20	(-.36)	-.15	-.07	.15	.06	.06
COMPETITION IN PARTY	.06	(.41)	-.16	.02	.10	.20	-.14
COMMITMENT TO POSITION	(-.38)	(.30)	.03	-.02	.00	.20	.01
AMBITION	(-.48)	.04	-.14	.12	.04	.20	(.30)
IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS	-.16	.17	.07	-.04	.03	-.22	.07
HOURS CAMPAIGNING	.04	.06	.14	-.01	.12	-.13	.09
HOURS ON POLITICS	-.09	-.02	.14	.06	.16	-.20	.14
FUTURE ACTIVITY	-.18	(.40)	-.20	-.04	-.09	(.32)	-.04
PARTY COMMUNICATION	.20	-.11	.09	-.05	.10	-.11	-.04
WORKER LOYALTY	.00	.08	-.04	.00	-.18	(-.41)	-.10
VOTER LOYALTY	.12	.19	.18	-.27	-.23	-.20	-.25
SUPPORT AT WORK	(.66)	(.45)	.13	(-.39)	-.02	.21	(-.30)
SUPPORT AT HOME	.02	-.11	(.42)	-.19	.13	(-.59)	.04
JOINS GROUPS	(-.40)	.08	.24	.25	.08	-.15	(.30)
POLITICAL HERITAGE	-.13	-.10	.00	-.09	-.10	-.03	.03

^aThese are eta relationships rather than gammas.

leaders are more likely to find family support for their political views than younger workers who still live with their parents.

Occupational status: Support at work is the only party experience variable related to occupation. The relationship is negative. Those with high occupational status are much more likely to experience mixed political support at their place of work. This is because most of those who have high occupational status deal with the public (e.g., lawyers, real estate agents, insurance agents), while those with lower status only deal with their co-workers (e.g., laborers and clerks).

Income: This variable is not related to any of the measures of party experience. Income may be one of the most important variables in accounting for political activities in the population at large, but among party activists income is irrelevant.

Religion: Republicans are more heavily Protestant than Democrats. Non-protestants tend to live in precincts where their party is a distinct minority. The reasons for this are unclear. Protestants tend to achieve "higher" positions in both parties than their non-protestant brethren. Non-protestants are more likely to say that they wish to increase their activity in the future. Non-protestants are also more likely to desert their party when it nominates a "radical" candidate. Most of those who deserted their party (particularly Democrats) tended to be Roman Catholic. But most Catholics did not desert their party (recall that only a dozen partisans deserted). Non-protestants have less "support at home" for their political views than Protestants.

Education: Unsuccessful candidates are the best educated activists in the stratarchy. Their median education level is above sixteen

years (i.e., almost all of them have had some graduate work). Successful candidates are not far behind. Novices are the least educated group. This is because so many novices were college students at the time of the interview. The better-educated respondents are more ambitious for further party and public office. The better educated respondents are also more likely to report mixed political support at work (education and occupational status are very highly associated) and more likely to join groups outside the political party.

Ethno/Race and Party Experience

The relationships between party experience variables and ethno/race are examined in greater detail in summary Table 5.5. This table shows that ethno/race is meaningfully related to seven party experience variables.

Party: Ethno/race is very strongly related to party. Most non-whites are Democrats. This may be largely a reflection of the fact that over thirty percent of the Democratic voters and only five percent of the Republican voters in Tucson are non-white (Arrington 1969, pp. 51-54).

Number of campaigns worked: Within the Democratic party, most Mexicans and blacks are newcomers, while both of the Republican Mexicans are very experienced party workers. This negative relationship within the Democratic Party holds even when controls for age are introduced. Among those under forty, the gamma association between ethno/race and number of campaigns worked is $-.46$. It is clear that non-white

TABLE 5.5
GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ETHNO/RACE AND PARTY EXPERIENCE
CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

	ENTIRE SAMPLE	DEMOCRATS ONLY ^c	POSITION IN STRATARCHY ^c		NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED		AMBITION ^c A GREAT DEAL OF	SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS ^c A GREAT DEAL OF	HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	
			NOVICES	CANDIDATES	FEW	MANY			FEW	MANY
PARTY	(-.73)		(-.75)	(-.50)	b	(-.36)	(-.76)	(-.60)	(-.72)	(-.68)
POSITION	.13 ^a	.13 ^a			.09 ^a	.02 ^a	.18 ^a	.26 ^a	.10 ^a	.25 ^a
PARTY BALANCE IN PRECINCT	-.13	(.44)	(.35)	(-.38)	.16	(-.46)	.12	-.11	-.01	-.20
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED	-.10	(-.34)	.17	.14			(-.37)	(-.32)	.10	(-.35)
KIND OF PARTY EXPERIENCE	-.04	-.11	-.02	.17	(.53)	(.50)	-.14	-.06	-.18	.11
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE	(-.36)	(-.61)	-.26	(-.69)	(.64)	.08	(-.62)	(-.37)	.10	(-.69)
COMPETITION FACED WITHIN PARTY	(.41)	(.39)	(.59)	(.70)	(.60)	.03	(.74)	.20	(.40)	(.43)
COMMITMENT TO PRESENT POSITION	(.30)	(.51)	(.44)	-.02	(.38)	.20	.00	(.39)	.16	(.46)
AMBITION	.04	.15	b	b	(.43)	-.10		-.23	.16	(.36)
SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS	.17	(.40)	(.82)	b	(.60)	b	(.36)	b	(.66)	b
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING	.06	-.20	(.84)	(-.60)	.16	(-.30)	-.09	(-.36)		
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT ON POLITICS	-.02	-.11	(.35)	.22	.11	.01	-.13	(-.30)	.29	-.01
SELF ESTIMATE OF FUTURE ACTIVITY	(.40)	(.42)	(.37)	(.63)	(.57)	.11	(.41)	.22	.06	.81
ASSESSMENT OF PARTY COMMUNICATION	-.11	-.09	-.16	(-.32)	-.25	.02	(-.34)	(-.34)	.11	(-.32)
PARTY LOYALTY AS A WORKER	.08	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
PARTY LOYALTY AS A VOTER	.19	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT WORK	(.45)	(.37)	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT HOME	-.11	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
PROCLIVITY TO JOIN GROUPS	.08	.11	.22	(.69)	.17	-.03	.29	.05	.15	.09
POLITICAL HERITAGE	-.10	(-.36)	.08	-.10	.03	-.19	(.32)	-.15	.04	-.29
N=	(80)	(40)	(30)	(30)	(41)	(39)	(47)	(48)	(37)	(43)

^aThese are eta relationships rather than gammas.

^bThe N in some columns or rows is too small to permit interpretation.

^cSince there were only two non-whites in the Republican sample, this category is omitted. Similarly, there were almost no non-whites who were committeemen and this category is left out. Only a couple of Mexicans and blacks reported that they were not at all ambitious and described politics as being of no importance to them, so these divisions are also excluded from this table.

Democrats have only recently entered the political arena. The Republicans may have the opposite "problem" of no new minority group members having joined in recent years.

Self described role: This variable is negatively related to ethno/race. Non-whites tend to be "self-oriented" rather than "other oriented" or ideologically oriented. Mexicans and blacks say they are in politics because they like the work, or because they wish to further their careers.

Competition faced within party: Mexicans and blacks face more competition within their own party than do whites. Part of the reason for this may be that most of the non-whites came from the Tucson barrio and ghetto where Democrats are generally unopposed in the general election. This tends to make primary competition more vigorous in those areas.

Commitment to present position: Non-whites are more committed to their present positions or more willing to leave such positions for "higher" office than are Anglos. In short, Mexicans and blacks are more ambitious than whites in terms of this simple measure.

Self described importance of politics: Politics is much more important to blacks and Mexicans than to whites. A very high percentage of non-whites describe politics as being "very important" to them personally.

Self estimate of future activity: Non-whites say that they will be "more active" in the future more often than Anglos. Again, it can be seen that Mexicans and blacks have a greater commitment to politics.

To summarize, non-whites in Tucson are both less likely to attain "higher" political position in the stratarchy and more likely to want such positions. They "try harder" but "achieve less." The Mexicans are very important to the Democratic Party in Southern Arizona. The Democrats cannot win without Mexican-American voters. If the Democrats fail to give many Mexicans positions of prominence, it may be because the party believes that minorities cannot turn to the Republicans as a viable alternative.

Summary

Two socioeconomic status variables are related to the belief system variables. Education is positively related to issue consciousness, ethno/race is related to dogmatism through the concentration of Mexicans and blacks in the Democratic novice group, and there are meaningful associations between party expectation variables and occupational status and education. In the main, however, SES is unrelated to ideology, party expectation, machiavellianism, and dogmatism within the party stratarchies of Tucson, Arizona.

There are meaningful relationships between party experience and SES. Those with high educational attainment and high occupational status tend to go "higher" in the party stratarchy, get more experience, and stay involved longer. There is also evidence that women and non-whites do not attain as "high" a position as white males. This is not the result of less effort and/or experience in politics. Women and non-whites are as active and women have as many years experience as most white men. Yet they do not have the prestigious positions occupied by the latter in either party.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In the first chapter of this dissertation two key questions are posed to direct this research: 1) Are there differences between the attitudes and ideology of individuals who occupy the various strata of major American political parties? and 2) If there are such differences, what factors are associated with them?

The answer to the first question is a qualified "no." Party activists largely share attitudes and beliefs with others in their own political party. This conclusion is discussed in detail in the next section of this chapter.

On the other hand, some differences in belief system variables can be detected in these data (particularly in issue consciousness), and such differences can be seen as associated with various measures of party experience. Each belief system variable seems to be responsive to different aspects of party experience. Each measure of attitudes and beliefs utilized in this study will be examined in a separate section below.

The effects of socioeconomic status on these variables will also be summarized while another section of this chapter will indicate the kinds of future research that might prove profitable to study further belief systems in party stratarchies. The last section discusses the implications of these findings for American politics.

Groups of Like Minded People

Flinn and Wirt (1965) once described local party leaders as being "groups of like minded men." This would seem to describe local party leaders in Tucson as well as those they examined in Ohio. The similarity is particularly striking in attitudes toward the proper role of the party and the measures of machiavellianism and dogmatism. Almost all the respondents ranked below the middle score on the Mach IV and the Short Dogmatism scales. The overwhelming majority of Tucson party activists agreed that the parties should be more programmatic and democratic, and compromise should not be extended to giving in on important issues in order to win elections.

These uniformly low scale scores are in sharp contrast to the results that have been obtained by those who have used these scale items on other respondents. Soule and Clarke (1970) found that about half of the delegates to the 1968 Democratic National Convention they interviewed were "professionals." This means that many of their respondents thought that the party should not be more programmatic, should not become more democratic, and that compromise on issues to win was a good thing. Rokeach (1960 and 1968) and others who have used the various dogmatism scales (Robinson and Shaver 1969, pp. 334-352) have found that in most populations there are equal numbers of high and low dogmatic scorers. While Christie and Geis (1970) have only applied machiavellianism scales to limited test populations (mostly freshman psychology students), they have always found as many "high Machs" as "low Machs."

Because this study utilized unique measures of ideology using open-ended questions, there is no way to compare the results directly

with other studies. It seems unlikely that this sample could be considered uniform in issue consciousness since the raw scores on this measure ranged from thirteen to sixty. Partisanship is quite another matter. The McClosky et al. (1960) thesis states that party activists in each party will agree about what government should and should not do, and that the differences between Democratic and Republican notions about government will be clear and extensive. The partisanship scores of Tucson activists would seem to bear out this thesis. Only one respondent preferred the opposition party's beliefs to those of his own party. Three other respondents had neutral scores of fifty. The other seventy-six respondents were clearly "true believers" of the message of their party.

This uniformity in belief systems is very significant, given the heterogeneity of this sample in terms of party experience. The sample includes individuals who have worked for the party for more than twenty years, and others who have worked only for a few months. It contains those who work for the party full time, and those who have worked only a few hours in their life. Some respondents have run for office, and others have rung doorbells for the party. The sample includes those whose family has been active in the party for many generations and those whose family is actually in the other major party. Yet all these people seem largely similar to one another in terms of the belief system variables.

Bowman and Boynton (1966) have constructed a recruitment model which seems to fit these data quite well. They argue that individuals with certain characteristics (beliefs, attitudes, social and educational

background) form a "pool" of individuals from which the parties recruit activists. Only those in this pool are considered eligible for party activity. Most of the recruitment is self-recruitment, but only individuals in this pool volunteer for political work. It would appear from the Tucson data that the characteristics of individuals in this pool may be more inclusive than Bowman and Boynton imagined. It is probable that before party activity of any type has occurred, the potential activist is relatively non-dogmatic, non-machiavellian, partisan, issue conscious, in favor of programmatic parties, for greater intraparty democracy, and opposed to too much compromise to win elections. Those members of the population who do not share most of these beliefs and attitudes are not in the pool of potential activists. Those within this pool who become activists are the ones who receive a special incentive to participate through a relative or acquaintance who encourages them, or an event which stimulates them.

The Democrats and Republicans recruit from separate pools of activists. While the members of both parties agree on party expectations and share low scores on dogmatism and machiavellianism, they are diametrically opposed to one another on important public issues.

The Interrelationships of the Belief System Variables

The belief system variables examined in this study are largely unrelated to each other, although the desire for programmatic parties is related to machiavellianism ($G = .57$) and to willingness to compromise to win ($G = .50$). No other belief system variables are meaningfully related to any others. These are distinct, separate elements of belief

within the stratarchy. Moreover, the different aspects of party experience that are related to these variables underline their separate, complex character.

Party Experience and Ideology

Issue Consciousness

As Table 6.1 reveals in summary form, issue consciousness is related clearly to ambition. This relationship is important, because the variation within this belief system variable is much greater than for any others. There are no studies which deal directly with hypotheses about how party activists might differ in issue consciousness. One could extrapolate from general comments by Epstein (1967) that he believes those who hold public office would be less issue conscious, since they derive their satisfaction in political activity from office holding and not from ideology. From Joyner (1971) one might get just the opposite impression. He implies that office holders should be more issue conscious because they deal with policy for long hours every day. In fact, we find that issue consciousness is only related to the position the activist wishes to hold, not the one he currently holds or has held in the past. Joyner may be partially correct. The ambition variable assumed that public office holding was in some sense "higher" than holding party office. We find that those who want to hold public office are more issue conscious than those who want to stay in the party organization.

Some unanswered questions arise here. Does the ambitious individual prepare himself for public office by study of public issues? Or

TABLE 6.1

SUMMARY OF MEANINGFUL GAMMA RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BELIEF SYSTEM VARIABLES
AND PARTY EXPERIENCE VARIABLES

	IDEOLOGICAL VARIABLES		PARTY EXPECTATION VARIABLES			MACH IV	DOG- MA- TISM
	ISSUE CONS- CIOUS- NESS	PART- ISAN- SHIP	PRO- GRAM PART- IES	COM- PRO- MISE	IN- TRA- PARTY DEMO.		
PARTY POSITION			.29 ^a	.24 ^a	.42 .30 ^a		-.30
PARTY BALANCE IN PRECINCT							
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS WORKED				.31			
KIND OF PARTY EXPERIENCE							
SELF DESCRIBED ROLE		.30					.27
COMPETITION FACED WITHIN PARTY							
COMMITMENT TO PRESENT POSITION					.36		
AMBITION	.38						
SELF DESCRIBED IMPORTANCE OF POLITICS							
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT CAMPAIGNING			.36				
HOURS PER WEEK SPENT ON POLITICS			.32				
SELF ESTIMATE OF FUTURE ACTIVITY			.25				
ASSESSMENT OF PARTY COMMUNICATION					.34		
PARTY LOYALTY AS A WORKER	-.35	.35			.67		
PARTY LOYALTY AS A VOTER		.40		-.26			
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT WORK							
POLITICAL SUPPORT AT HOME				.40			
PROCLIVITY TO JOIN GROUPS				.26			
POLITICAL HERITAGE				.36			

^a These are eta relationships rather than gammas.

does the person concerned with issues decide to run for office? Or are both ambition and issue consciousness caused by some third variable such as intelligence? Unfortunately, the research design precludes answering such questions in this study.

Issue consciousness is also related to party loyalty as a worker. Once again the cause and effect relationship is unclear. Do those who desert the party become more issue conscious? Or are those who are issue conscious more likely to desert their party? The latter seems intuitively to be the more tenable hypothesis, but either is possible.

Partisanship

Much of the research on ideology has centered on the relationship between party experience and partisanship. Joyner (1971), Barber (1965), Costantini (1963), and Epstein (1967) all argue that candidates and public office holders are less partisan than those who occupy the party organization. In this study no such relationship was found. This may be a product of the kinds of candidates examined here. Distinctions between the party in government and the party organization may exist on the state-wide and national level, but not on the local level. Congressmen, for example, might be less partisan than county chairmen; while legislators are not less partisan than central committee members. This might be true because legislators are often considered part-time office holders. However, legislators are actually full time politicians in Arizona as in most other states. It appears more likely that the hypothesized relationship between office holding and moderation is just not present, at least not in Tucson.

Many authors have suggested that those who spend more time and attention on party activity and politics are more likely to be partisan (Converse, 1964; Marvick and Nixon, 1961; Valen and Katz, 1964; Eldersveld, 1964; and Harned, 1961). The data from this study contradict the notions of these researchers. Partisanship is not meaningfully associated with number of hours per week spent on politics or on campaigns.

There is no meaningful relationship between number of campaigns worked and partisanship. Thus there is no confirmation of Soule and Clarke (1971) who found that newcomers were more "ideological."

Soule and Clarke (1971) and Eldersveld (1964) also found that competition sharpened partisanship. Sorauf (1963) found exactly the opposite to hold true for legislators. For this sample, there appears to be no relationship between inter- or intra-party competition and partisanship.

Partisanship is related to political ambition according to Eldersveld (1964) and Sorauf (1963). Again we find no relationship in Tucson. Nor could confirmation of Flinn and Wirt's (1965) cross pressure hypothesis be found in these data. No association between political support at home or at work and partisanship exists here. This study indicates no association between party communication and partisanship, despite the strong relationship observed by both Eldersveld (1964) and Valen and Katz (1964).

Partisanship is related to self-described role. Those who gave an "other-oriented" reason for involvement are more partisan than those who gave "self-oriented" rationales. Eldersveld (1964) had found that

motivation for involvement and partisanship were not related in Detroit. The data presented in this study do not corroborate the other literature on partisanship in any regard.

Partisanship is also positively related to party loyalty. As one would expect, those who desert their party are not as partisan as those who remain loyal. This does not seem surprising, because it confirms the largely ideological nature of modern political party participation.

Party Experience and Party Expectations

Perhaps the most interesting finding in this paper is that there is no single measure which can describe the attitudes of Tucson activists toward the proper role and method of operation of the political parties. James Q. Wilson (1962) originally thought that such attitudes could be largely summarized by his concept of "professionalism." Hofstetter (1971) and Soule and Clarke (1970) found confirmation of his thesis. Such attitudes are too complex in Tucson to be summarized by a single measure. Instead, three separate measures of attitudes toward the party are taken from the work of Soule and Clarke and used in this paper. These measures are distinct variables that are related to different aspects of party experience. In short, professionalism as it has been defined by other scholars does not exist in this sample.

Soule and Clarke (1970) found that their measure of professionalism was not associated with ideology. This finding is confirmed to an extent in this study. None of the three measures of party expectations used here are related to either partisanship or issue consciousness. As stated above, these are separate and distinct dimensions of belief.

Desire for Programmatic Parties

Desire for programmatic parties is strongly related to the amount of commitment the individual is currently making to the political party, and his future commitment. The more time and energy the activist spends on politics, the less he desires programmatic parties. This party expectation measure is definitely related to intensity of participation and not to the length of time a person has been involved. There is no relationship between number of campaigns worked and desire for programmatic parties. Those who are greatly involved come to have non-programmatic interests. They may come to regard other goals of the party as more important than policy, or they may just begin to see ideology as a divisive element in an activity to which they are devoting much of their time and energy.

The relationship of position in the stratarchy to programmatic parties is too small to be of much concern. The eta relationship is only .29, which means that it accounts for less than nine percent of the variation in this scale. Since almost all the respondents scored a "1" or a "2" on this measure, this weak association accounts for practically no variation in this measure.

Willingness to Compromise to Win

Those with more experience in group activity--in and out of the party--and a deeper familial heritage in the party are more likely to be willing to compromise to win. This finding partly confirms Soule and Clarke's analysis (1970) which showed that "professionalism" was related to length of time in party work and the extent of the activist's family

roots in the party. The explanation for this could be that experience in group work teaches individuals to compromise to achieve group goals. Such insights may be passed on from generation to generation. Those who are not willing to compromise may find group participation difficult and thus not become active in party or non-party groups. It is also possible that a third variable accounts for both secondary group experience and willingness to compromise to win.

Table 6.1 reiterates that willingness to compromise to win is weakly related to position in the stratarchy. The eta figure is so low that it accounts for only a minute portion of the explained variance of this truncated variable.

Desire for Intraparty Democracy

Desire for intraparty democracy seems related to the various measures of contentment with the party in general. It is related to assessment of party communication, party loyalty as a worker, and commitment to present position. The strong association between this variable and party can be accounted for by the greater party harmony extant within the Republican group. Those who are content with their party do not feel the need for greater "democracy," while those who are not content make "democracy" the panacea for their problems.

This measure of party expectations is, like the other two, related to position in the stratarchy. Once again, the relationship is so low as to be trivial.

Machiavellianism

The Mach IV scale is not related to any measures of socioeconomic status or ideology. This is a confirmation of the results that Christie and Geis (1970) and their associates have obtained with this measure. They have found that machiavellianism does not relate to ideology (pp. 39-41), nor to SES (chapter XVI). They have also found (chapter XI) that when "playing legislature" (a laboratory game devised at Columbia) the "High Machs" "ignored issues" and were able to "log roll" easily. "Low Machs" got involved in issues and voted according to their feelings about the issues instead of their role defined "self interest." High Machs deal with issues in the manner that "professional" politicians would, while low Machs behave like "amateurs." Perhaps this is reflected in the high association between machiavellianism and a lack of desire for programmatic parties, and the fact that most Tucson activists are low Machs and are in favor of more programmatic parties.

There are no meaningful relationships between machiavellianism and any of the party experience variables. Perhaps this is to be expected. In the experiments done at Columbia and elsewhere on this trait, the experimental groups were normally divided into high Machs and low Machs with the dividing line being the mid-point on the Mach IV scale. Almost none of the Tucson respondents were high Machs according to this definition. There may be too little variation in scores on this variable to use it in differentiating among activists.

Christie and Geis (1970, chapter XVII) emphasize that high Machs perform best in unstructured situations. When rules and procedures are introduced into a "game" the low Machs do as well or better than the

high Machs at getting "rewards." Perhaps political party activity is too structured to encourage high Machs to get involved. Yet parties are relatively unstructured, free-wheeling organizations (Eldersveld 1964, chapter 1). If there are too many rules for high Machs to participate in parties, then there must be no situations in which high Machs have advantages outside of the laboratory.

A better explanation for the lack of response variation on the Mach IV Scale may be found in its high association with measures of "social desirability." Christie and Geis (1970, p. 19) remark that individuals who are sensitive to the opinions of others will often answer machiavellian questions as though they believe that social norms do not sanction the use of interpersonal deceit. Individuals may be too machiavellian to admit their own tactics in dealing with others. To handle this problem, the people at Columbia have abandoned the Mach IV Scale and use a new Mach V Scale which involves a complex "forced choice" procedure. It may be that the sample of party activists examined here contains many machiavellian individuals who "psyched out" the test. One fairly well placed politician remarked after the interview: "It would be interesting to know how many of my colleagues would truthfully answer those questions about personal honesty." Indeed, it would be interesting to know how many really did.

Dogmatism

Only two party experience variables are related to dogmatism. Democratic novices are more dogmatic than Republican novices, and those who gave an "other directed" reason for political involvement are more dogmatic than those who gave a "self oriented" reason for involvement.

These two fairly weak relationships are the only two meaningful associations between dogmatism and party experience.

Perhaps the self-described role variable is related to dogmatism because the question of "role" cuts deep into the psyche of the individual. The "self-oriented" individual is at peace with the world. He is honest with himself. He knows he likes people and is in politics because he wants to deal with them. Or, he is in politics for career goals. If he is honest enough to admit his own self interest to himself and to the interviewer, then he is unusually frank and open. Many of the "other-oriented" individuals may be genuinely altruistic, but some of them may be individuals who cannot admit their own motives to themselves or to others. In this way the more dogmatic respondents end up as "other oriented."

The tendency for Democratic novices to be more dogmatic is difficult to explain. Part of this relationship can be accounted for by the concentration of young Mexicans in this group. Yet this can account for only part of the relationship. For some reason the State Convention formed under the new McGovern Rules seems to have attracted more dogmatic types than the Republican "politics as usual."

There are few studies which indicate how dogmatism and party experience are related. Joyner (1971) argues that candidates and those heavily involved in politics should be less dogmatic than other activists because the give and take of public office requires a non-dogmatic approach to life and other people. No association between public office holding and dogmatism was discovered in Tucson. All the respondents

are uniformly low in the trait of dogmatism, indicating that lack of dogmatism may be a prerequisite to political participation on any level.

Socioeconomic Status

SES and the Belief System

Eldersveld (1964) and Ippolito (1969b) have both concluded that SES is not highly related to other political and social variables within the party strataarchy. This is corroborated in this study. Socioeconomic status is not meaningfully related to either dogmatism or machiavellianism (after controls for party are introduced); and SES is not related to ideology, except that those who are better educated have higher issue consciousness scores. SES is related to the party expectation variables. Desire for programmatic parties is strongly and positively related to occupational status, while desire for intraparty democracy is negatively related to occupation. Desire for intraparty democracy is also negatively related to education. High status individuals are more likely to reject the idea of programmatic parties and accept the notion of more democracy in party councils. The better educated respondents also desire more democracy within the party.

This pattern of relationship between SES and party expectation is quite different from the pattern found by Soule and Clarke (1970), who discovered that "amateurs" were younger and had higher incomes than "professionals." They found no relationship between "professionalism" and educational attainment.

SES and Party Experience

Socioeconomic status is very highly related to party experience. Those activists with higher status (i.e., more education, occupational prestige, and age) tend to achieve "higher" positions in the party stratarchy. The non-white activists appear to try harder to attain important positions in the parties and to achieve less than their Anglo counterparts. This pattern of failure to achieve is fairly typical in studies of blacks and other minority groups (Clarke, 1973).

Further Research

A full investigation of the relationship of party experience to the belief system is limited in this dissertation by the lack of a control group. A control group--such as a random sample of voters in Tucson--would allow the identification of the important differences within the stratarchy. Some distinctions examined here may be trivial compared to massive differences between the elite and voters that the use of such a control group might uncover. For example, are party activists unusually low Mach subjects, or is high machiavellianism something that exists only among psychology professors and freshmen in college? Are the issue consciousness scores obtained in this study much greater, or about the same as would be obtained from non-activists? These are the sorts of questions that can be answered only with the use of a control group. The primary thrust of this dissertation is the examination of distinctions within the party stratarchy, but a control group helps put such distinctions into focus and prevents laboring the trivial and overlooking the stupendous.

Time sequence data on belief system and party experience variables would also be useful. This kind of data would primarily answer questions about the relative importance of recruitment and socialization. Time sequence data is not as important here as for some other studies. There are few meaningful associations between party experience and the belief system, and only one belief system variable is meaningfully related to number of campaigns worked; therefore, little is to be gained by the use of time sequence data.

Other minor modifications in the research design would be of value in future efforts. For example, some of the party experience variables could be eliminated since this research has shown them to be of limited value. An improved measure of machiavellianism (such as the more recently devised Mach V) could also be utilized.

The research design could be improved by expanding the elements in the stratarchy. A sample of candidates for national office (e.g., congressional candidates) could be compared to legislators and perhaps county chairmen. This would give further range to the measures of participation and experience utilized in this study. Although there were few meaningful differences between legislators and individuals in the party organization, there might be very important differences between congressmen and county chairmen.

Practical Politics

In much of the literature on political representation, and much of the older literature on party processes, attention centers on the strata of the party which is, or ought to be, dominant in policy making

functions. Such arguments can be based on "rights" or on practical grounds. This dissertation has contributed nothing which would be relevant to a discussion of "rights." If one believes that the party organization has the "right" to make the decisions for the party, no practical arguments about the impact of this on policy making seem relevant. If the discussion of party processes is based on practical grounds, this dissertation may have some relevance.

Epstein (1967) argues that the party in government (public office holders) should be dominant because they are more moderate and flexible on issues and are elected directly by the voters. Duverger (1954) states that the party organization should be dominant because it is the source of the power of the party and cannot be thwarted without the party destroying itself. If the data on Tucson is broadly applicable to American political parties, the Epstein/Duverger dispute is irrelevant in the United States.

The minor differences that are present within the party in Tucson are not related to position in the stratarchy in any meaningful way. This means that whether policy making functions for the party are performed by the party organization or the party in government, the same kinds of people will be making the decisions. Both strata of the party contain individuals who share important personality traits such as a lack of dogmatism.

There are differences in the stratarchy in terms of race and sex. Certain kinds of rules (e.g., the McGovern Rules for delegate selection) can enhance the power of the "lower" portion of the stratarchy, and therefore increase the power of women and non-whites. Since women

and non-whites in the party strata do not differ from white males in terms of the belief system variables, such changes would seem to be alterations that will not produce policy change. This participation is symbolically important. It shows that women and minority group members can participate effectively in politics, but the actual decisions they make are probably not different than white males would have made.

Changes in the rules under which political parties operate usually alter the substance of the decisions made. However, if the Tucson pattern obtains elsewhere, such changes may not be the product of the strata of the party that is entrusted with making the decisions. Many authors have complained that the strata nature of parties is itself a hindrance to effective policy making. The parties cannot make effective decisions because power is so diffused throughout the structure. The party is not a hierarchy, but these authors claim that it should be (American Political Science Association, 1950). Perhaps this position has merit. However, the insight that the various parts of the strata are occupied by essentially similar individuals, reduces the apparent importance of coordination within the party. Would party activists make different decisions together in a closely knit hierarchy than they make separately in a loose strata? Maybe they would, but this is a much different question than that posed by the "responsible party" advocates, who would have us believe that different strata are occupied by different kinds of people who conflict with each other over ideology and tactics.

Perhaps activists behave differently in various strata of the party because of the unique pressures that are placed upon them. If so, these pressures have curiously failed to mold their belief system in any meaningful manner in Tucson. Party activists are indeed "groups of like minded people."

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

BELIEF SYSTEMS IN POLITICAL PARTY STRATARCHIES

PRE/POST INTERVIEW DATA

Thumbnail sketch of Respondent to give anything to help coding: _____

1. Respondents Party: /Democratic /Republican
2. Respondents Party position:
- /Executive Committeeman /Convention Delegate (Amateur)
- /Successful Candidate /Unsuccessful Candidate
3. Percentage of vote in R precinct for R Presidential candidate _____
4. Percentage of vote in R precinct for R Congress candidate _____
5. Percentage of vote cast for R if he is a candidate _____
6. Respondents sex: /Male /Female
7. Respondents ethno/race: /White /Black
- /Mexican /Other (specify) _____

FIRST, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL START WITH SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCE.

8. WHAT WAS THE FIRST CAMPAIGN IN WHICH YOU WERE A PARTY WORKER OR A CANDIDATE?

(year) _____

9. (if not the 1972 campaign) HAVE YOU WORKED FOR THE PARTY FAIRLY REGULARLY SINCE THEN?

YES (if no) BETWEEN WHAT YEARS WERE YOU NOT WORKING FOR THE PARTY?

10. HAVE YOU EVER HELD ANY (OTHER) PARTY OFFICE?

NO (if yes, probe) WHAT OFFICE(S) WAS/WERE THAT? DURING WHAT DATES WAS THAT?

11. HAVE YOU EVER HELD ANY (OTHER) ELECTIVE OR APPOINTIVE PUBLIC OFFICE?

NO (if yes, probe) WHAT OFFICE(S) WAS/WERE THAT? DURING WHAT DATES WAS THAT? (legislator: get number of terms)

12. PEOPLE GET INVOLVED IN POLITICS FOR DIFFERENT REASONS. COULD YOU TELL ME, IN YOUR OWN WORDS, WHY YOU GET INVOLVED? WHAT DO YOU GET OUT OF POLITICAL ACTIVITY? (no more than five)

probe: ANYTHING ELSE? _____

13. THIS LAST FALL/SPRING WHEN YOU RAN IN THE PRIMARY/DISTRICT ELECTION HOW SERIOUS WAS THE OPPOSITION TO YOUR CANDIDACY?

A SERIOUS CONTEST FOR THE OFFICE
 A CONTEST, BUT YOU WERE PRETTY SURE OF WINNING
 ANOTHER CANDIDATE, BUT HE DID NOT HAVE A CHANCE
 NO OPPOSITION

14. DO YOU EXPECT TO RUN FOR THIS OFFICE AGAIN NEXT TIME?

YES NO PLANS TO RUN FOR SOME OTHER OFFICE
 (if the latter, probe) WHAT OFFICE IS THAT? _____

15. ARE THERE OTHER POLITICAL OR GOVERNMENTAL POSITIONS, LOCAL, STATE, OR FEDERAL, WHICH YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEEK SOME DAY?

NO (if yes) WHAT ARE THEY? _____

16. HOW IMPORTANT WOULD YOU SAY POLITICAL ACTIVITY IS TO YOU PERSONALLY?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT VERY IMPORTANT
 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT NOT VERY IMPORTANT
 NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL

17. HOW MANY HOURS A WEEK DO YOU SPEND IN POLITICAL ACTIVITY DURING THE PERIOD JUST BEFORE AN ELECTION?

_____ HOURS PER WEEK

18. HOW MANY HOURS A WEEK DO YOU SPEND IN POLITICAL ACTIVITY DURING THE REST OF THE YEAR, THAT IS IN NON-CAMPAIGN PERIODS?
 (for legislators add OTHER THAN DURING THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION)

_____ HOURS PER WEEK

26. WHO DID YOU VOTE FOR IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RACE FROM THIS DISTRICT IN THE LAST ELECTION--THE REPUBLICAN SAVOIE, OR THE DEMOCRAT UDALL?

UDALL, DEMOCRAT SAVDIE, REPUBLICAN NONE, OTHER

NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PEOPLE YOU MEET AND ASSOCIATE WITH OUTSIDE THE PARTY.

27. (to everyone who works outside the home) TAKING FIRST THE PEOPLE YOU MEET AT YOUR WORKING PLACE--DO YOU THINK THAT MOST PEOPLE THERE VOTE ABOUT THE SAME WAY YOU DO?

SAME DIVIDED ALL DIFFERENT FROM R

28. AND HOW IS IT IN YOUR FAMILY, DO THOSE CLOSEST TO YOU VOTE THE SAME WAY AS YOU DO?

SAME DIVIDED ALL DIFFERENT FROM R

29. DO YOU BELONG TO ANY GROUPS OR ORGANIZATIONS OUTSIDE THE PARTY SUCH AS LABOR UNIONS, CHURCH GROUPS, SOCIAL CLUBS, NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS, PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, OR HOBBY CLUBS?

NO (if yes) COULD YOU NAME THE GROUPS, PLEASE? _____

30. (if yes) HAVE YOU EVER HELD ANY OFFICES IN THESE GROUPS?

NO (if yes) PLEASE TELL US WHAT OFFICES YOU HELD.

31. AND LOOKING AT YOUR FAMILY, DO YOU REMEMBER WHETHER YOUR FATHER WAS A DEMOCRAT, A REPUBLICAN, OR AN INDEPENDENT?

DEMOCRAT REPUBLICAN INDEPENDENT OR OTHER

32. AND YOUR MOTHER, WAS SHE A DEMOCRAT, A REPUBLICAN, OR AN INDEPENDENT?

/DEMOCRAT

/REPUBLICAN

/INDEPENDENT OR OTHER

33. WERE EITHER OF YOUR PARENTS VERY ACTIVE POLITICALLY? THAT IS, DID EITHER OF THEM DO MORE THAN REGISTER AND VOTE? DID THEY WORK FOR EITHER POLITICAL PARTY, OR RUN FOR ANY PUBLIC OFFICE, OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?

/NO

/YES, FATHER

/YES, MOTHER

(if yes, probe) WHAT DID HE/SHE/THEY DO POLITICALLY?
WHAT OFFICES DID THEY SEEK OR HOLD?
DID THEY WORK CONSISTENTLY FOR THE PARTY?

notes on handling ideology questions:

questions 34 through 37 are a complete set;
the idea is to bring out any ideas about government that R may have;
the probes are used as necessary;
no issues or policies are mentioned for R;
if R repeats an issue from a previous question, it is not counted;
if R thinks of a response after a question is passed, it is permissible to go back to the previous questions to record the response;
any and all probes are tried until R has given ten responses to a question or until all probes elicit a negative response;
no more than fifteen responses to any-questions are permissible;
the back of the pages may be used to record responses if necessary;
the probes are necessary to make sure the R tells what he thinks government should do and what it should not do and which government (state, local, or federal) should do it.

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO READ TO YOU SOME OF THE KINDS OF THINGS THAT PEOPLE ATTRIBUTE TO POLITICAL LEADERS LIKE YOURSELF. SOME OF THE STATEMENTS MAY SOUND KIND OF SILLY OR SIMPLE-MINDED, BUT YOUR RESPONSES WILL TELL US ABOUT THE KINDS OF RELATIONSHIPS YOU HAVE WITH OTHER PEOPLE. I'LL READ THE STATEMENTS ONE AT A TIME, AND YOU JUST TELL ME WHETHER YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH STATEMENT.

38. A PERSON WHO COMPLETELY TRUSTS ANYONE ELSE IS ASKING FOR TROUBLE.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

39. THERE IS NO EXCUSE FOR LYING TO SOMEONE ELSE.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

40. ONCE I GET WOUND UP IN A HEATED DISCUSSION, I JUST CAN'T STOP.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

41. POLITICAL PARTY PLATFORMS SHOULD BE DELIBERATELY VAGUE IN ORDER TO APPEAL TO THE MOST VOTERS.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

42. A PERSON WHO THINKS PRIMARILY OF HIS OWN HAPPINESS IS CONTEMPTABLE.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

43. A GOOD POLITICAL PARTY WORKER MUST SUPPORT ANY CANDIDATE NOMINATED BY HIS PARTY EVEN IF HE BASICALLY DISAGREES WITH HIM ON THE ISSUES.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

44. GENERALLY SPEAKING PEOPLE WON'T WORK HARD UNLESS THEY'RE FORCED TO DO SO.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

45. MOST PEOPLE ARE BASICALLY GOOD AND KIND.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

46. IN THE HISTORY OF MANKIND THERE HAVE PROBABLY BEEN JUST A HANDFUL OF REALLY GREAT THINKERS.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

47. POLITICAL PARTY UNITY IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN PERMITTING FREE DISCUSSION WHICH MAY DIVIDE THE PARTY.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

48. ONE SHOULD TAKE ACTION ONLY WHEN SURE IT IS MORALLY RIGHT.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

49. I WOULD OBJECT TO A PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE WHO COMPROMISES ON HIS BASIC VALUES EVEN IF THAT WERE NECESSARY TO WIN THE ELECTION.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

50. WHEN YOU ASK SOMEONE TO DO SOMETHING FOR YOU, IT IS BEST TO GIVE THE REAL REASONS FOR WANTING IT RATHER THAN GIVING REASONS WHICH CARRY MORE WEIGHT.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

51. IN THIS COMPLICATED WORLD OF OURS THE ONLY WAY WE CAN KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON IS TO RELY UPON LEADERS OR EXPERTS WHO CAN BE TRUSTED.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

52. HONESTY IS THE BEST POLICY IN ALL CASES.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

53. MOST PEOPLE WHO GET AHEAD IN THE WORLD LEAD CLEAN, MORAL LIVES.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

54. THE BEST WAY TO HANDLE PEOPLE IS TO TELL THEM WHAT THEY WANT TO HEAR.

/AGREE

/DISAGREE

55. THE BEST WAY TO LIVE IS TO PICK FRIENDS WHOSE TASTES AND BELIEFS ARE THE SAME AS YOUR OWN.
- /AGREE /DISAGREE
56. IT IS SAFEST TO ASSUME THAT ALL PEOPLE HAVE A MEAN STREAK AND IT WILL COME OUT WHEN THEY ARE GIVEN A CHANCE.
- /AGREE /DISAGREE
57. IT IS OFTEN DESIRABLE TO RESERVE JUDGEMENT ABOUT WHAT'S GOING ON UNTIL ONE HAS A CHANCE TO HEAR THE OPINIONS OF PEOPLE ONE RESPECTS.
- /AGREE /DISAGREE
58. THE BIGGEST DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MOST CRIMINALS AND OTHER PEOPLE IS THAT THE CRIMINALS ARE STUPID ENOUGH TO GET CAUGHT.
- /AGREE /DISAGREE
59. MOST PEOPLE JUST DON'T KNOW WHAT'S GOOD FOR THEM.
- /AGREE /DISAGREE
60. NEVER TELL ANYONE THE REAL REASONS YOU DID SOMETHING UNLESS IT IS USEFUL TO DO SO.
- /AGREE /DISAGREE
61. I AM A PERSON WHO WORKS AND VOTES FOR MY PARTY WHETHER OR NOT I LIKE THE CANDIDATES OR THE ISSUES MY POLITICAL PARTY SUPPORTS.
- /AGREE /DISAGREE
62. MOST PEOPLE ARE BRAVE.
- /AGREE /DISAGREE
63. THE WORST CRIME A PERSON CAN COMMIT IS TO ATTACK PUBLICLY THE PEOPLE WHO BELIEVE IN THE SAME THINGS HE DOES.
- /AGREE /DISAGREE

64. IT IS HARD TO GET AHEAD WITHOUT CUTTING CORNERS HERE AND THERE.
/AGREE /DISAGREE
65. FUNDAMENTALLY, THE WORLD WE LIVE IN IS A PRETTY LOVELY PLACE.
/AGREE /DISAGREE
66. AS A PARTICIPANT IN THE POLITICAL PARTY NOMINATING PROCESS, MY ONLY JOB IS TO CHOOSE A CANDIDATE WHO WILL WIN ELECTIONS.
/AGREE /DISAGREE
67. IT IS POSSIBLE TO BE GOOD IN ALL RESPECTS.
/AGREE /DISAGREE
68. MY POLITICAL PARTY LEADERS OFTEN MAKE TOO MANY ARBITRARY DECISIONS WITHOUT CONSULTING WITH ENOUGH PARTY WORKERS.
/AGREE /DISAGREE
69. PART-TIME VOLUNTEERS PLAY A MORE IMPORTANT ROLE IN THE POLITICAL PARTY'S CAMPAIGN THAN ANY OTHER PEOPLE IN THE PARTY.
/AGREE /DISAGREE
70. THE PRINCIPLES OF A CANDIDATE ARE AS IMPORTANT AS WINNING ELECTIONS.
/AGREE /DISAGREE
71. IT IS WISE TO FLATTER IMPORTANT PEOPLE.
/AGREE /DISAGREE
72. IT IS BETTER TO BE HUMBLE AND HONEST THAN IMPORTANT BUT DISHONEST.
/AGREE /DISAGREE
73. CONTROVERSIAL POSITIONS SHOULD BE AVOIDED IN POLITICAL PARTY PLATFORMS SO THAT THERE WILL BE PARTY UNITY.
/AGREE /DISAGREE

THE LAST PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR PERSONAL BACKGROUND.

74. FIRST, HOW OLD ARE YOU? _____ YEARS OLD.

75. WHAT IS YOUR PRINCIPLE OCCUPATION? PLEASE TELL US PRECISELY WHAT YOU DO AND IN WHAT TYPE OF INDUSTRY YOU WORK.

(if retired, unemployed, student, or housewife, get usual, former, or head of household occupation also)

76. COULD YOU TELL ME HOW MUCH INCOME YOU AND YOUR FAMILY MADE ALTOGETHER DURING THE LAST YEAR, (1971)? I MEAN BEFORE TAXES, INCLUDING THE INCOME OF EVERYONE IN THE FAMILY. (hand R the card) JUST CALL OFF THE LETTER ON THIS CARD IN FRONT OF THE CORRECT AMOUNT.

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. <input type="checkbox"/> Under \$5,000 | I. <input type="checkbox"/> 12,000-12,999 |
| B. <input type="checkbox"/> 5,001-5,999 | J. <input type="checkbox"/> 13,000-13,999 |
| C. <input type="checkbox"/> 6,000-6,999 | K. <input type="checkbox"/> 14,000-14,999 |
| D. <input type="checkbox"/> 7,000-7,999 | L. <input type="checkbox"/> 15,000-15,999 |
| E. <input type="checkbox"/> 8,000-8,999 | M. <input type="checkbox"/> 16,000-16,999 |
| F. <input type="checkbox"/> 9,000-9,999 | N. <input type="checkbox"/> 17,000-17,999 |
| G. <input type="checkbox"/> 10,000-10,999 | O. <input type="checkbox"/> 18,000-18,999 |
| H. <input type="checkbox"/> 11,000-11,999 | P. <input type="checkbox"/> 19,000-19,999 |
| Q. <input type="checkbox"/> 20,000 or more | |

77. WHAT IS YOUR RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE? WHAT CHURCH DO YOU ATTEND?

ALL PROTESTANT CATHOLIC JEWISH OTHER

78. WOULD YOU TELL US ABOUT YOUR EDUCATION, YOUR FORMAL SCHOOLING?

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
 ATTENDED COLLEGE COLLEGE GRADUATE
 H.S. PLUS NON COLLEGE TRAINING POST GRADUATE COLLEGE

APPENDIX B

**COMPLETE LISTING OF ALL RESPONSES
TO THE FOUR OPEN-ENDED IDEOLOGY QUESTIONS**

This is a complete listing of all the responses given to the ideology questions. Responses mentioned by three or more respondents are all included. Those remarks made by one or two individuals are put into summary categories. The listing shows the number of such responses made by Democrats, by Republicans, and by both parties added together. It is important to note that this is the number of responses, not the number of respondents making the responses. This is especially important for the summary categories where one respondent may account for several of the number of comments.

ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE OF THE RESPONSES	DEM	REP	TOT
AGRICULTURE			
The Farm Labor Act should be repealed, it is bad	20	0	20
The Farm Labor Act is good, should be retained	0	13	13
Help farm laborers	7	0	7
Keep Farmers Unions/Chavez out of Arizona	0	4	4
Federal Government should handle Farm Labor	4	0	4
End agricultural subsidies	7	6	13
Other comments about agricultural subsidies	3	4	7
TOTAL	41	27	68
CONSUMER ISSUES			
Too many state monopolies, increase competition, use anti-trust to break up monopolies and large corporations	2	8	10
Need more research into product standards and safety	1	2	3
End subsidies to business	0	3	3
Repeal the State Small Loan Act (which allows higher interest on small loans)	3	0	3
Open dating and uniform packaging are needed	3	0	3
More regulation and control of public utilities	7	2	9
General: more control of business consumer practices	8	8	16
The Federal Truth in Lending Act is good	2	2	4
State or Federal no fault insurance should be passed	6	7	13
Other comments	8	5	13
TOTAL	40	37	77

 ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE
 OF THE RESPONSES

DEM REP TOT

CRIME

The Tucson Police helicopter is good, retain it	5	7	12
The Tucson Police helicopter is bad, get rid of it	6	1	7
Other comments on the helicopter	1	2	3
Government must control firearms	4	0	4
Against government gun control	0	2	2
Reinstate the death penalty (just modified by the Court)	8	16	24
Against reinstatement of the death penalty	3	0	3
Use the death penalty against skyjackers	0	5	5
General support of the Police	1	3	4
Need open disclosure of blind trusts to fight the Mafia	2	2	4
Supreme Court decisions have tied police hands too much	4	12	16
Courts must be more strict, give longer sentences	2	6	8
Against Tucson Police Chief suggestion that swearing at a Cop be made a crime	1	2	3
Need more police, higher pay, and more training/equipment	9	13	22
Other comments about skyjacking	1	4	5
More community relations by police needed	1	2	3
General anti-police statements	4	0	4
Courts are not responsible for crime	6	1	7
Other comments on crime	9	9	18
TOTAL	67	87	154

DEFENSE

Cut the defense budget a great deal	7	0	7
Reduce bases overseas	9	3	12
Stop being the policeman for the world	6	2	8
Stay out of little wars like the Indo-Pakistani War	3	2	5
Other anti-military statements	8	0	8
Leave other countries alone	9	4	13
Eliminate waste or fat in Defense	6	4	10
Need a strong or stronger defense posture	0	9	9
We must be involved in the world	0	5	5
Need a newer or bigger Navy	0	3	3
We can only negotiate with Russia from superiority	0	3	3
All volunteer army is good	2	2	4
Opposed to an all volunteer army	2	1	3
Other comments	5	7	12
TOTAL	57	45	102

DRUGS

Stop the flow of drugs from overseas, police the borders and use diplomacy to stop production overseas	9	8	17
Stricter punishment for drug peddlers	4	8	12
Increase education in schools against drugs	3	2	5

ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE OF THE RESPONSES	DEM	REP	TOT
DRUGS (CONTINUED)			
Establish rehabilitation centers for addicts	5	1	6
Against harsher punishment for the use of drugs	8	5	13
Legalize marijuana	6	3	9
Don't try to stop drugs overseas or at the borders	2	0	2
State rehabilitation of alcoholics and decriminalization of alcoholism are good	6	11	17
Other comments	8	4	12
TOTAL	51	42	93
EDUCATION			
More federal aid to education is needed	4	3	7
The State Government should stop prescribing curriculum, fiscal policies, or other things for local schools	9	9	18
The State should not impose a tenure system on the schools	4	0	4
Spend more money on the schools	9	3	12
More bi-lingual educational programs are needed	8	0	8
More special minority education programs are needed	4	0	4
The State should provide free high school textbooks	11	2	13
The State Superintendent of Education, Schofstell (a Republican) is bad	6	0	6
State-wide school financing with local control is needed	9	13	22
More vocational education is needed	7	6	13
Give aid to parochial schools	1	3	4
Don't give aid to parochial schools	0	4	4
Other comments	33	30	63
TOTAL	105	73	178
FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDOMS			
End smut laws, censorship, control of toplessness, etc.	3	5	8
Against newsmen being forced to reveal sources before grand juries	3	2	5
End the pressure on the news media by Nixon and/or Agnew	3	0	3
The government should control pornography, toplessness, etc.	0	2	2
The government should control the news media more	4	1	5
The courts should allow voluntary prayer in schools	0	3	3
The Federal Government should stop prying, snooping, wire taps, bugging, etc.	7	1	8
TOTAL	20	14	34
FOREIGN POLICY			
The trips to China and Russia were good	10	19	29
The trips to China and Russia were bad	3	1	4
Give less support to the United Nations	2	3	5
Establish diplomatic relations with Cuba	1	5	6

 ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE
 OF THE RESPONSES

 DEM REP TOT

FOREIGN POLICY (CONTINUED)

In general Nixon has done a good job in foreign affairs	2	6	8
The tarrif should be raised	4	0	4
The Soviet wheat deal was a bad thing	5	2	7
We should get more trade concessions from Japan and E.E.C.	3	0	3
Encourage more foreign trade	4	5	9
Don't support Fascist or Racist distatorships	4	0	4
Encourage peaceful conduct of international relations	2	3	5
Give more aid to Israel	4	0	4
Don't give aid to Israel	2	1	3
End foreign aid	4	5	9
Change foreign aid so that it gets to the people or so that it only goes to proven allies	6	2	8
Increase foreign aid	3	1	4
Henry Kissinger is too powerful	3	1	4
Other comments	14	11	25
TOTAL	76	65	141

HEALTH

The State must establish more neighborhood health and mental health clinics	12	5	17
Federal socialized medicine (Kennedy-British style) is needed or any kind of socialized medicine would be good	11	0	11
Federal Health re-insurance (Nixon-Australian style) is needed	2	6	8
Against any form of socialized medicine	0	3	3
Government must train more nurses and paramedics and expand the amount of medical care they can provide legally	3	4	7
More money for medical research is needed	3	0	3
The State should supply more free services such as dialysis machines, radio therapy, etc.	2	3	5
The State should establish more training centers for the retarded, handicapped, elderly	7	3	10
The State should put pressure on hospitals to reduce costs and coordinate services within communities	3	2	5
Government should encourage more private enterprise hospitals	2	2	4
The Federal Government should pay 100% of costs of catastrophic illnesses	1	4	5
Government should train more Medical Doctors	3	1	4
More State health care for indigents is needed	2	3	5
Tucson South Side Hospital is a good thing	7	4	11
Not enough money was appropriated for South Side Hospital	2	3	5
Other comments	12	11	23
TOTAL	72	54	126

 ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE
 OF THE RESPONSES

DEM REP TOT

HOUSING

Federal programs to build, subsidize, and help the poor live in regular type housing are needed (235 and 236 programs)	7	6	13
More public housing and urban renewal are needed	12	2	14
Stronger building codes are needed locally	6	5	11
Federal Government should get out of housing	0	2	2
All government should get out of housing	0	3	3
Other comments	6	6	12
TOTAL	31	24	55

INFLATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Wage/price guidelines are good as they are	0	9	9
Wages are now controlled, but profits and prices should also be controlled	12	1	13
Against wage/price controls under any circumstances	1	6	7
The Federal Government must underwrite more local projects like Roosevelt did during The Depression	3	0	3
To curb inflation cut domestic programs and balance the budget	1	8	9
Encourage multi-national corporations and twin-cities	0	1	1
Discourage multi-national corporations and twin-cities	6	0	6
Provide more aid in converting workers from war industry and the military to peace industries	4	4	8
Other comments	9	8	17
TOTAL	36	37	73

JUDICIARY

Elect judges more	5	0	5
Appoint judges more	2	3	5
The Courts are doing too much legislating	3	3	6
Support for the Nixon-Burger Supreme Court and criticism for the Liberal-Warren Court	2	6	8
Support for the Liberal-Warren Court and criticism for the new Nixon-Burger Court	9	2	11
Other Comments	14	3	17
TOTAL	35	17	52

LABOR

State minimum wage law is needed	2	1	3
Repeal the State right-to-work law	5	0	5
Government should control unions better, use anti-trust against them or break them up	0	4	4
The N.L.R.B. must be tougher on unions	0	3	3
Control illegal Mexican labor better	4	0	4
Other comments	9	5	14
TOTAL	20	13	33

 ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE
 OF THE RESPONSE

 DEM REP TOT

LAND USE PLANNING

A State Land Use Plan is needed	10	17	27
Be tougher on developers, force them to pay for more utilities before they are allowed to build	14	13	27
Stop urban sprawl by forcing the growth of Tucson within its present boundaries	12	12	24
Build green belts around Tucson	3	3	6
Use the Satellite City concept for more urban growth	2	2	4
Water conservation and flood control are needed	3	10	13
A Federal Land Use Plan is needed	0	3	3
Other comments	5	10	15
TOTAL	49	70	119

POLLUTION

Be tougher on industry, make them stop polluting, be tougher on the mines	17	11	28
Must do more educating of public and youth groups on ecology and the steps that the individual can take	3	0	3
Federal standards on cars and water pollution must be increased	9	9	18
More efforts to clean up litter and solid waste are needed	3	2	5
Industry needs tax incentives or subsidies to clean itself	2	6	8
More research is needed	2	2	4
Must develop new sources of clean power such as solar energy, thermal energy or nuclear power	2	2	4
More recycling of glass, paper, and other disposables	2	1	3
More conservation of natural resources is needed	3	0	3
It is bad that Governor Williams (a Republican) was allowed to block stronger pollution controls	2	1	3
Other comments that more needs to be done about pollution	19	14	33
The E.P.A. standards and work thus far has been good	3	6	9
The Federal Government should do less on pollution and the States should take over more of the task	1	6	7
The pollution control agency in Arizona should be independent of the State Health Department	2	2	4
Arizona has good pollution laws	1	4	5
Other comments indicating that pollution control should not be pushed too far or too fast for industry or society to adjust	3	6	9
TOTAL	74	72	146

POVERTY

Head Start and Follow Thru programs of the O.E.O. are good	3	0	3
Legal Services program is good	6	1	7
Food Stamps program is good	3	1	4

 ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE
 OF THE RESPONSE

 DEM REP TOT

POVERTY (CONTINUED)

Poverty agencies should remain independent of local and State governments	8	2	10
Other general comments in support of the War on Poverty	8	1	9
General comments against the War on Poverty	0	4	4
Suggested changes in the War on Poverty	3	0	3
TOTAL	31	9	40

PRISON REFORM

Rehabilitation, education, vocational training are needed	15	12	27
Time release and half-way houses are a good idea	6	2	8
Segregate first time offenders from hardened criminals	7	8	15
Convince employers and unions to hire ex-convicts	4	2	6
Locate non-maximum-security prisons in urban areas	0	5	5
Other comments that prisoners should be treated humanely	4	1	5
Other comments on ways to make prisoners more likely to adjust to society before release and reduce recidivism	5	3	8
Prevent escapes from the Florence maximum security prison	2	8	10
Jail should be a bad place to teach prisoners a lesson	0	3	3
Separate police functions from corrections functions	0	4	4
Other comments	2	4	6
TOTAL	45	52	97

RACE

Bussing for racial balance is good	4	0	4
Against bussing for racial balance	3	13	16
Ghetto schools must be improved, given more money	4	3	7
State and Federal F.E.P.C. are good	4	0	4
Racial quotas and reverse discrimination should be ended	3	2	5
Other comments in favor of more government action to equalize the positions of blacks and Mexicans	17	3	20
Other comments against more government action to equalize the positions of blacks and Mexicans	0	7	7
TOTAL	35	28	63

REVENUE SHARING

State revenue sharing is good	2	7	9
Federal revenue sharing is good	5	16	21
State revenue sharing must be more fairly distributed, especially more to Counties and more to Tucson and Phoenix	4	3	7
Federal guidelines are needed on how the money is spent	2	2	4
Instead of revenue sharing, lower Federal taxes for States	2	3	5
Other comments	2	5	7
TOTAL	17	36	53

 ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE
 OF THE RESPONSE

DEM REP TOT

STATES' RIGHTS

General states rights positions	0	7	7
Government is too big	0	3	3
Government cannot or should not do so much for people	0	4	4
Other comments that States and/or localities should take over programs from the Federal Government	2	6	8
The Federal Government is good and should do more	3	1	4
TOTAL	5	21	26

TAXES--FEDERAL

Close tax loopholes, make the rich pay more taxes	10	2	12
Hit corporate taxes harder, make them pay more	5	0	5
End the oil depletion allowance	2	1	3
Income taxes need to be more progressive	4	0	4
Income taxes should not be too progressive, don't tax high incomes more	1	2	3
Cut Federal taxes	0	3	3
Other comments	4	3	7
TOTAL	26	11	37

TAXES--STATE

Remove the sales tax from food and medicine	6	5	11
Increase corporate taxes, increase severance taxes	9	3	12
Eliminate or drastically cut property taxes	4	12	16
Make property taxes more progressive	3	0	3
Reduce property taxes on older people	2	2	4
Increase all kinds of taxes to compensate for loss of property tax	3	7	10
Don't increase State taxes	0	6	6
The State must coordinate all local taxing	0	4	4
Other comments	1	5	6
TOTAL	28	44	72

TRANSPORTATION

Tucson should build a monorail or other fixed track system	8	5	13
Tucson should push busses and other mass transit systems	11	12	23
Tucson needs better traffic control, pairing of streets, improvement of major arteries, or a bantam expressway	10	15	25
Discourage the use of automobiles	3	3	6
Don't build more freeways or highways	9	1	10
Break the Highway Trust Fund to build more mass transit	1	4	5
Build bike paths	3	0	3
Institute an effective automobile inspection system	2	2	4
Finish or expand the interstate highway system	3	4	7
Tucson and Pima County should repair and pave more roads	6	12	18

 ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE
 OF THE RESPONSE

DEM REP TOT

TRANSPORTATION (CONTINUED)

Tucson should not build a mass transit system at this time	1	3	4
More research is needed	1	2	3
AMTRAK is a good thing, should be continued or expanded	1	2	3
Other comments on rail roads	5	1	6
Other comments on ways to make auto traffic better	2	5	7
Other comments in favor of mass transit for Tucson	2	1	3
TOTAL	68	72	140

VIETNAM

Get out now, period	23	8	31
Other comments that are against Nixon's handling of the war	3	1	4
Nixon is doing a good job handling the war, we must get out with honor, or we must remain there as long as they need us	3	14	17
Poses the dilemma of "all out or get out" without indicating which horn of that dilemma is actually favored	2	1	3
Other comments	0	1	1
TOTAL	31	25	56

WELFARE

Government should create jobs in the public sector as the employer of last resort	12	7	19
Those not disabled on welfare should be found jobs and made to work	3	10	13
Give welfare recipients individual attention, job training, day care facilities, or anything else necessary to get them off welfare	6	7	13
The State Welfare Department should give more money to each welfare family	10	0	10
Get the cheaters off welfare, but make sure those who need the help continue to get it	3	2	5
General comments for more welfare and easier qualifications	12	6	18
Cut red tape to get more welfare to the people in need	3	1	4
The Federal Government must take over all welfare	1	2	3
A minimum income plan or negative income tax is needed	3	3	6
Work incentives must be built into the system	2	5	7
Get rid of welfare cheaters	2	3	5
More birth control and voluntary sterilization is needed to cut the number of children on welfare	2	1	3
Don't institute any type of guaranteed income plan	0	4	4
General comments for less welfare and more qualifications	3	5	8
The State Department of Public Welfare is good	0	2	2
The State Department of Public Welfare is bad	2	1	3
Other comments	3	4	7
TOTAL	67	63	130

 ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE
 OF THE RESPONSE

DEM REP TOT

WOMENS' LIBERATION

Pass the Equal Rights Amendment, women need equal pay for equal work	4	3	7
Government should establish day care centers	4	2	6
Government must take over family planning centers, establish clinics, distribute birth control devices	6	2	8
Other comments on birth control	2	1	3
Arizona should institute a no fault divorce system	1	2	3
Legalize abortion	6	9	15
Don't legalize abortion	3	0	3
Other comments restricting the conditions under which abortion laws can or should be changed	0	2	2
Other comments	0	2	2
TOTAL	26	23	49

OTHER FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ISSUES AND COMMENTS

The Executive power (the President) is too strong, Congress must assert itself	7	3	10
Must improve methods of evaluating programs (P.P.E.S.)	2	1	3
Revamp the Federal Government's structure, cut employees, bureaucracy, and red tape	7	8	15
Reorganize the Cabinet along the functional lines suggested by Nixon	0	5	5
Spend less money for domestic social welfare programs	0	4	4
Spend more money for domestic social welfare programs	2	0	2
Comments about the regulation of television	4	1	5
Give more benefits to Veterans	1	2	3
Expand the National Park system	4	1	5
Give more money and attention to the elderly	12	4	16
Give more money and attention to the Indians	2	1	3
Nixon serves special interests instead of the people	3	0	3
Other comments that Nixon is bad	10	4	14
Nixon is doing a good job	0	5	5
Other comments about politicians in the Federal Government or about the Federal party system or the National Parties	12	13	25
Other comments	19	16	35
TOTAL	85	68	153

OTHER STATE GOVERNMENT ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Reorganize the State Executive along departmental lines with the Governor as the chief administrator	5	7	12
Against reorganization of the State Executive	4	1	5
In favor of recalling Governor Williams (a Republican)	2	0	2
Against recalling Governor Williams	2	6	8
Other good comments about Governor Williams	1	5	6
Other bad comments about Governor Williams	8	3	11

 ISSUE AND THE SUBSTANCE
 OF THE RESPONSE

DEM REP TOT

 OTHER STATE GOVERNMENT ISSUES AND COMMENTS (CONTINUED)

Legalize prostitution	5	0	5
Reduce costs and eliminate waste, frills, and red tape	1	2	3
Re-codify the State Civil and Criminal Codes	2	5	7
Comments about the election laws	2	5	7
Increase the pay of State Legislators	2	9	11
Spend the State surplus funds on current programs	5	3	8
Keep Arizona on a pay-as-you-go basis	0	6	6
Pull out of the Central Arizona Project	1	2	3
The adjustments of the age of majority are good	6	7	13
Other good comments about the State Government	1	6	7
Other bad comments about the State Government	6	4	10
Other comments	9	14	23
TOTAL	62	85	147

OTHER LOCAL GOVERNMENT ISSUES AND COMMENTS

County personnel must be changed to get rid of incompetants	1	4	5
Pay more attention to the South and West sides of Tucson	4	1	5
City Government does not respond to the people	2	3	5
Zoning procedures require more public participation	5	7	12
Other comments about planning and zoning	2	8	10
Pay the salaries for Police and Firemen suggested by the arbitration panel	3	0	3
The decentralization of city facilities is good	2	3	5
Sheriff's Office (Democratically controlled) is bad	0	6	6
Parks, recreation areas, craft centers are good	6	3	9
The Community Center Complex is a good idea	3	5	8
Build more sidewalks, sewers, water mains	3	2	5
Merge many city and county departments	6	5	11
Combine city and county governments into a Metro Government	0	3	3
Other comments about changing the structure of government	3	9	12
Encourage more industry to come to Tucson	3	2	5
Give tax credits to new industry	2	2	4
Donate land to new industry	2	1	3
Don't encourage new industry to come to Tucson	3	3	6
Model Cities is good	22	0	22
Other good comments about Tucson City Government	1	8	9
Other bad comments about Tucson City Government	3	2	5
Other comments that Pima County Government is bad	2	5	7
Other comments	11	16	27
TOTAL	89	98	187

GRAND TOTAL

DEM--1,389

REP--1,312

(2,701)

REFERENCES

- Adorno, Theodore W. et al. 1950. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Agger, Robert E., Daniel Goldrich, and Bert E. Swanson. 1964. The Rulers and the Ruled. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- _____, Marshall N. Goldstein, and Stanley A. Pearl. 1961. "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning," Journal of Politics. 23 (August), 477-506.
- Alford, Robert R. and Harry M. Scoble. 1968. "Community Leadership, Education, and Political Behavior," American Sociological Review. 33 (April), 259-272.
- American Political Science Association. 1950. Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System. New York: The American Political Science Association.
- Arrington, Theodore S. 1969. "Grass Roots Organization: A Study of Precinct Committeemen." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Arizona, Tucson.
- _____. 1972. "Letter to the Editor," American Political Science Review. 66 (March), 183-184.
- Barber, James David. 1965. The Lawmakers: Recruitment and Adaptation to Legislative Life. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Barnes, Samuel H. 1966. "Ideology and the Organization of Conflict: On the Relationship Between Political Thought and Behavior," Journal of Politics. 28 (August), 513-530.
- _____. 1968. "Party Democracy and the Logic of Collective Action," in William J. Crotty (ed.) Approaches to the Study of Party Organization. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Bell, Daniel. 1960. The End of Ideology. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Blalock, Hubert. 1960. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Bowman, Lewis and G. R. Boynton. 1966. "Recruitment Patterns Among Local Party Officials: A Model and Some Preliminary Findings in Selected Locales," American Political Science Review. 60 (September), 667-676.

- Boyd, Richard W. 1972. "Popular Control of Public Policy: A Normal Vote Analysis of the 1968 Election," American Political Science Review. 66 (June), 429-449.
- Brittan, Samuel. 1968. Left or Right: The Bogus Dilemma. London: Secher and Warburg.
- Brody, Richard A. and Benjamin I. Page. 1972. "Comment: The Assessment of Policy Voting," American Political Science Review. 66 (June), 450-458.
- Brown, Steven R. 1970. "Consistency and the Persistence of Ideology: Some Experimental Results," Public Opinion Quarterly. 34 (Spring), 60-68.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. The American Voter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Cantril, Hadley and Lloyd Free. 1967. Political Beliefs of Americans. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Christie, Richard and Florence L. Geis. (eds.) 1970. Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press.
- Clarke, James W. 1973. "Race and Political Behavior," in K. S. Miller and R. M. Dreger (eds.) Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States. New York: Seminar Press, Inc.
- Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics," in David E. Apter (ed.) Ideology and Discontent. New York: The Free Press.
- _____. 1970. "Attitudes and Non-Attitudes: Continuation of a Dialogue," in Edward R. Tufte (ed.) The Quantitative Analysis of Social Problems. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishers.
- Costantini, Edmond. 1963. "Intraparty Attitude Conflict: Democratic Party Leaders in California," Western Political Quarterly. 16 (December), 956-972.
- Costner, Herbert L. 1965. "Criteria for Measures of Association," American Sociological Review. 30 (June), 341-353.
- Dolbeare, Kenneth M. and Patricia Dolbeare. 1971. American Ideologies. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. An Economic Theory of Democracy. New York: Harper and Brothers.

- Duverger, Maurice. 1954. Political Parties: Their Organization and Activities in the Modern State. London: Methuen and Co.
- Eldersveld, Samuel J. 1964. Political Parties: A Behavioral Analysis. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co.
- Epstein, Leon. 1967. Political Parties in Western Democracies. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Erbe, William. 1964. "Social Involvement and Political Activity: A Replication and Elaboration," American Sociological Review. 29 (November), 198-215.
- Flinn, Thomas A. 1964. "Party Responsibility in the States: Some Causal Factors," American Political Science Review. 58 (March), 60-71.
- _____ and Frederick W. Wirt. 1965. "Local Party Leaders: Groups of Like Minded Men," Midwest Journal of Political Science. 9 (February), 77-98.
- Forthal, Sonya. 1946. Cogwheels of Democracy: A Study of a Precinct Captain. New York: The William Frederick Press.
- Freeman, Linton C. 1965. Elementary Applied Statistics for Students in Behavioral Science. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Goodman, Leo and William Kruskal. 1954. "Measures of Association for Cross Classifications," Journal of the American Statistical Association. 49 (December), 733-764.
- Gosnell, Harold Foote. 1937. Machine Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Greenstein, Fred I. 1969. Personality and Politics. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company.
- Harned, Louise. 1961. "Authoritarian Attitudes and Party Activity," Public Opinion Quarterly. 25 (Fall), 393-399.
- Hennessy, Bernard. 1959. "Political and Apolitical: Some Measurements of Personality Traits," Midwest Journal of Political Science. 3 (November), 336-355.
- _____. 1970. "A Headnote on the Existence and Study of Political Attitudes," Social Science Quarterly. 51 (December), 463-476.
- Hirschfield, R. S., Bert E. Swanson, and Blanche D. Blank. 1962. "A Profile of Political Activists in Manhattan," Western Political Quarterly. 15 (September), 489-506.

- Hofstetter, C. Richard. 1971. "The Amateur Politician: A Problem in Construct Validity," Midwest Journal of Political Science. 15 (February), 31-56.
- Ippolito, Dennis S. 1969a. "Motivational Reorientation and Change Among Party Activists," Journal of Politics. 31 (November), 1098-1101.
- _____. 1969b. "Political Perspectives of Suburban Party Leaders," Social Science Quarterly. 49 (March), 800-815.
- _____ and Lewis Bowman. 1969. "Goals and Activities of Party Officials in a Suburban Community," Western Political Quarterly. 22 (September), 572-580.
- Jacob, Herbert. 1962. "Initial Recruitment of Elected Officials in the U. S.: A Model," Journal of Politics. 24 (November), 703-716.
- James, Judson L. 1969. American Political Parties: Potential and Performance. New York: Pegasus.
- Joyner, Conrad. 1971. The American Politician. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Kessel, John H. 1972. "Comment: The Issues in Issue Voting," American Political Science Review. 66 (June), 459-465.
- Key, V. O., Jr. 1958. Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.
- Kingdon, John W. 1966. Candidates for Office: Beliefs and Strategies. New York: Random House.
- Lane, Robert E. 1959. Political Life. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Lasswell, Harold. 1930. Psychopathology and Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1946. Power and Personality. New York: The Free Press.
- _____ and Abraham Kaplan. 1950. Power and Society. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet. 1944. The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lehnen, Robert G. 1968. "Political Beliefs in Mass Publics." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Iowa, Iowa City.

- Lipset, Seymour M. and Earl Raab. 1970. The Politics of Unreasons: Right Wing Extremism in America, 1790-1970. New York: Harper and Row.
- Lowl, Theodore J. 1967. "Party, Policy, and Constitution in America," in William N. Chambers and Walter D. Burnham (eds.) The American Party Systems: Stages of Political Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1969. The End of Liberalism. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc.
- Luttbeg, Norman R. 1965. "Belief Conflict in the Community: Leader and Follower Differences in Policy Preferences." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, Lansing.
- _____. 1968. "The Structure of Beliefs Among Leaders and the Public," Public Opinion Quarterly. 32 (Fall), 398-409.
- Marvick, Dwaine and Charles R. Nixon. 1961. "Recruitment Contracts in Rival Campaign Groups," in Dwaine Marvick (ed.) Political Decision-Makers: Recruitment and Performance. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Mayhew, David R. 1966. Party Loyalty Among Congressmen: The Difference Between Democrats and Republicans 1947-1962. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McClosky, Herbert. 1958. "Conservatism and Personality," American Political Science Review. 52 (January), 27-45.
- _____. 1964. "Consensus and Ideology in American Politics," American Political Science Review. 58 (June), 361-382.
- _____, Paul J. Hoffman, and Rosemary O'Hara. 1960. "Issue Conflict and Consensus Among Party Leaders and Followers," American Political Science Review. 54 (June), 406-427.
- McDonald, Ronald H. 1963. "Ideology and Political Appeals--A Theory for Analysis of Contemporary Belief Systems." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- McPhee, William N., Bo Anderson, and Harry Milholland. 1962. "Attitude Consistency," in William N. McPhee and William A. Glazer (eds.) Public Opinion and Congressional Elections. New York: The Free Press.
- Milbrath, Lester W. 1965. Political Participation. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co.

- _____. 1968. "The Nature of Political Beliefs and the Relationship of the Individual to the Government," American Behavioral Scientist. 12 (November-December), 28-36.
- Minar, David. 1961. "Ideology and Political Behavior," Midwest Journal of Political Science. 5 (November), 317-331.
- Nexon, David. 1971. "Assymetry in the Political System: Occasional Activists in the Republican and Democratic Parties 1956-1964," American Political Science Review. 65 (September), 716-730.
- Pierce, John C. 1970. "Party Identification and the Changing Role of Ideology in American Politics," Midwest Journal of Political Science. 14 (February), 25-42.
- Polsby, Nelson and Aaron B. Wildavsky. 1966. Presidential Elections: Strategies of American Electoral Politics. New York: Scribner and Sons.
- Pomper, Gerald M. 1971. "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System? What Again?," Journal of Politics. 33 (November), 916-940.
- _____. 1972. "From Confusion to Clarity: Issues and American Voters, 1956-1968," American Political Science Review. 66 (June), 415-528.
- Presthus, Robert. 1964. Men at the Top. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Repass, David E. 1971. "Issue Salience and Party Choice," American Political Science Review. 65 (June), 389-400.
- Riker, William H. 1962. The Theory of Political Coalitions. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Robinson, John P. and Philip R. Shaver. 1969. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center.
- Rokeach, Milton. 1960. The Open and the Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books.
- _____. 1968. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Rosenberg, Morris. 1955. "Some Determinants of Political Apathy," Public Opinion Quarterly. 18 (Winter), 349-366.
- _____. 1956. "Misanthropy and Political Ideology," American Sociological Review. 21 (December), 690-695.

- _____. 1957. "Misanthropy and Attitudes Toward International Affairs," Journal of Conflict Resolution. 1 (December), 340-345.
- Scoble, Harry M. 1967. Ideology and Electoral Action. San Francisco: Chandler Press.
- Smith, M. Brewster, Jerome Bruner, and Robert White. 1956. Opinions and Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Sorauf, Frank J. 1963. Party and Representation: Legislative Politics in Pennsylvania. New York: Atherton Press.
- _____. 1964. Political Parties in the American System. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- _____. 1968. Party Politics in America. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Soule, John W. and James W. Clarke. 1970. "Amateurs and Professionals: A Study of Delegates to the 1968 Democratic Convention," American Political Science Review. 64 (September), 888-898.
- _____ and _____. 1971. "Issue Conflict and Consensus: A Comparative Study of Democratic and Republican Delegates to the 1968 National Conventions," Journal of Politics. 33 (February), 72-91.
- Stouffer, Samuel et al. 1949. The American Soldier. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Valen, Henry and Daniel Katz. 1964. Political Parties in Norway. London: Tavistock Publications, Ltd.
- Wilker, Harry R. and Lester W. Milbrath. 1970. "Political Beliefs and Political Behavior," Social Science Quarterly. 51 (December), 477-493.
- Wilson, James Q. 1962. The Amateur Democrat. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.